

to me when I was a new Member of the Senate, in 1961.

His friendship meant a great deal to me, as I am sure it did to all of us.

His magnificent courage in the last months of his tragic disability was in the finest tradition of the people of his great State and of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a number of our colleagues in the Senate who would like to have the opportunity to deliver addresses on the life, character, and public service of the late distinguished Senator Clair Engle are absent from the Senate today in performance of their duties. Every Senator should have the opportunity to express his thoughts and make memorial statements concerning the late Senator from the State of California. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that absent Senators be permitted to make memorial addresses and insert statements in the Record eulogizing the late Senator Clair Engle until March 15. Not enough can be said about the contributions the late Senator from California made to our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTAYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR RECEIVING MESSAGES, FILING REPORTS, AND SIGNING ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session until Thursday, March 4, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my intention to move to adjourn the Senate until 11:30 a.m. Thursday next. The reason I desire the Senate to adjourn until 11:30 a.m. rather than the ordinary hour of 12 noon is to permit the recess of the Senate on that day from 12 noon until 1 o'clock to observe the exercises commemorating President Lincoln's second inauguration.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY AT 11:30 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Clair Engle, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11:30 a.m. on Thursday morning next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, March 4, 1965, at 11:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 1, 1965:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER

John Williams Macy, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the term of 6 years expiring March 1, 1971. (Reappointment.)

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Dwight J. Porter, of Nebraska, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

THE JUDICIARY

Harold Leventhal, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit, vice Wilbur K. Miller, retired.

Howard F. Corcoran, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia, vice Charles F. McLaughlin, retired.

Edward Allen Tamm, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit, vice Walter M. Bastian, retiring.

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

William L. Taylor, of New York, to be staff director for the Commission on Civil Rights.

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Michael Greenebaum, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1965, vice Joseph P. McMurray.

Michael Greenebaum, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1969.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 1, 1965:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Luther L. Terry, of Alabama, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted these words of the psalmist: *Wait on the Lord; be of good courage, and He shall strengthen thy heart.*

Almighty God, as we wait on Thee in prayer, we feel that Thou art holding before us many high hopes and longings which must be enshrined and enthroned in the life of humanity.

Fortify us by Thy spirit against the moods of doubt and discouragement and may we be more dedicated and diligent in behalf of the kind of a life that is just and merciful and that seeks the welfare of the needy.

Inspire us with a new spirit of generosity and love that unites us in one great struggle to emancipate all mankind and help it to find and enjoy a free and fuller life.

Grant that the quality of the Master's life may be more clearly revealed in us and use us in leading the members of the human family to find the way to the more blessed and abundant life.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 25, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 45. An act to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 21. An act to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROPOSED FOR LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State the power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the members of our State legislatures in accordance with law and with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Similar resolutions have been introduced in both the House and the Senate during this session.

A discharge petition has also been placed on the Speaker's desk on this issue, evidencing the much interest of the

Members of Congress, State legislatures, and others in this matter.

Many of our State legislatures are now in session working on reapportionment legislation.

Some 38 Members of the Senate have joined in cosponsoring similar legislation in the other body. Numerous State legislatures, including the General Assembly of Tennessee, have adopted resolutions memorializing Congress to act in this regard.

It is my feeling that a constitutional amendment which would invest in the people themselves the right to determine the makeup of their own State legislatures is needed and necessary in order that government by the consent of the people shall prevail.

I think this legislation is needed and that the House should promptly consider a proper amendment to the Constitution to be submitted to the States on reapportionment—and bicameral legislatures preserved on the basis and the pattern of the Federal Establishment.

REENACTMENT OF THE SECOND INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN ON EAST FRONT STEPS OF THE CAPITOL AT NOON ON THURSDAY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a resolution adopted in the 88th Congress, I take this opportunity to advise the Members of the House that the joint committee established under that resolution has completed arrangements to commemorate the second inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. There will be an authentic reenactment of the second inauguration of President Lincoln on the east front steps of the Capitol at noon on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has secured the services gratis of the famous Broadway and movie producer, Dore Schary, to stage the reenactment. Arrangements have been made for the distinguished U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and former Governor of Illinois, Adlai Stevenson, to narrate the reenactment. The famous actor, Robert Ryan, will play the role of Abraham Lincoln.

There will be a program including the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives [Mr. McCormack], and the famous historian, Bruce Catton.

Members may secure additional invitations by calling the office of the Doorkeeper. They may also secure tickets for the event. However, the reenactment ceremony is open to the public and no tickets will be required.

I hope that Members will participate in this important commemoration of the second inauguration of Abraham Lincoln, the theme of which was his famous

and immortal words: "With malice toward none, and with charity toward all."

I do not know of a more fitting time in the history of our country than now to be reflecting back to those immortal words. I urge the Members to give their full participation and support to this program.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

MISSISSIPPI AND EQUAL RIGHTS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday in Mississippi, U.S. District Judge Cox dismissed felony indictments against 17 defendants, who were accused in connection with the brutal slaying last summer of the 3 courageous young civil rights workers, including Sheriff Rainey and Deputy Sheriff Price of Neshoba County. In dismissing the indictment Judge Cox said:

The indictment surely states a heinous crime against the State of Mississippi, but not a crime against the United States.

I urge the Department of Justice to appeal this case immediately, but more than that I urge the Department of Justice to review the adequacy of present laws to deal with police brutality.

I have introduced a bill called the Improvement of State and Local Justice Act—H.R. 5427—which would provide criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence. When I first proposed this bill on May 2, 1963, I said:

Probably no civil rights issue is of more immediate concern to racial and ethnic minorities than the inequitable administration of justice. Police brutality is an old story to minority groups, but familiarity with the experience has made it no easier to bear. No reader of newspaper accounts of recent events in Mississippi will regard the problem as a thing of the past. Also, police power has been abused by refusal to protect members of minority groups from unlawful violence at the hands of private persons.

Two years later—and untold acts of violence under color of law later—that statement is still tragically true.

The acts for which the 17 defendants were indicted would violate at least four sections of H.R. 5427 which make it a

Federal crime for anyone, acting under color of law to:

First. Subject any person to physical injury for an unlawful purpose.

Second. Subject any person to unnecessary force during the course of an arrest or while the person is being held in custody.

Third. Refuse to provide protection to any person from unlawful violence at the hands of private persons, knowing that such violence was planned or was then taking place.

Fourth. Aid or assist private persons in any way to carry out acts of unlawful violence.

In addition, the Improvement of State and Local Justice Act authorizes the Attorney General to institute proceedings for preventive relief against any individual who, under color of law, excludes any person or groups of persons from grand or petit jury service on account of their race, color, or national origin.

If justice is to prevail in the courtrooms of Mississippi, and similar jurisdictions, then discrimination in the selection of grand and petit jurors must cease.

All too often the abuse of police power with the concurrence of local juries has caused the legal system to be regarded with fear and cynicism.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of legislation is essential if the right of every individual to the equal protection of the law at every level—local, State, and Federal—is to be guaranteed.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S 2D INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], in calling attention of the House to the ceremonies which will occur on Thursday noon on Capitol Plaza on the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's 2d inaugural.

The resolution to establish a joint House-Senate committee to commemorate this significant event was established at the initiative of a former Member of the House, the Honorable Fred Schwenkel, of Iowa. Although the events of last November 3 retired him from this body, it did not mean any lessening of his interest in this particular project. He has continued to devote his full energies to making this ceremony the fitting event it should be.

I am sure that all Members have Lincoln clubs and Civil War groups in their district and they will want to know that the souvenir programs and souvenir tickets will become Lincoln items to be treasured in the years to come.

I therefore suggest the Members avail themselves of these items, which may be obtained at the Doorkeeper's office.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S 2D INAUGURAL

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday we will celebrate the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's 2d inaugural.

This was a very historical occasion of course, but it was given lasting fame by his great address. That remarkable address, known for its famous phrase beginning, "With malice toward none, but with charity for all," summed up the civil war in concise, but above all in compassionate, terms.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, by act of this Congress Lincoln's second inaugural will be reenacted on Thursday. As a member of the joint committee planning this event, I want to reiterate to each Member of this body our cordial invitation to attend the ceremonies and participate in this historical event.

The famous film star, Robert Ryan, will play the role of Lincoln. Our Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, will narrate the reenactment. Dore Schary, the noted producer, writer, and director, will direct the scene, and also will produce a color film of the event for use throughout our Nation's schools.

We hope in this way not merely to call attention to the greatness of Lincoln, whose place in history certainly is secure; instead we hope to rekindle the magnificent vision which his words reveal and redirect our national purpose in line with his great goal.

I trust that a great number of the Members of this body as well as the members of their staffs will be present on this memorable occasion.

PEACE CORPS SCHOOL-TO-SCHOOL PROGRAM

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a word of commendation regarding the Peace Corps, and particularly to call attention to the Peace Corps school-to-school program.

Last week the director of this Peace Corps activity, Mr. Gene Bradley, received a special Freedom Leadership Award from the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, one of the highest awards granted this year.

Gene Bradley, as president of the Rosendale School PTA in Schenectady, N.Y., initiated the plan for the Rosendale PTA to provide funds for a schoolhouse in Casa Blanca, Colombia. With the cooperation of the Peace Corps and the support of its director, Sargent Shriver—but without any Federal financial support—the plan has gone forward.

The new schoolhouse in Colombia cost about \$1,000 with most of the funds going for building materials. Local volunteer labor in Colombia was contributed for the actual construction of the school.

Following the initiation of the Rosendale PTA project, Mr. Bradley took a leave of absence from his post as editor of the General Electric Forum to head the school-to-school program within the Peace Corps.

It is the hope of the Peace Corps that under this program 3,000 schools may be built around the world within the next 3 years.

In addition to the promotion of greater international understanding, the program permits an active interest and benefit to our American citizens—particularly the young people—who share in the sponsorship of such school buildings.

In making its Leadership Award, the Freedom Foundation cited Mr. Bradley, in part, "for self-effacing effort that children everywhere might understand the principles of the free way of life, and find hope and personal dignity through education."

It is fitting on this fourth anniversary of the establishment of the Peace Corps to note the success and the promise of the school-to-school program, and to extend congratulations to the Peace Corps Director, Sargent Shriver, and to the director of the school-to-school program, Gene Bradley.

SARGENT SHRIVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to join other Members of the House in paying tribute to the Peace Corps. This project which began as an experiment in cooperation with other nations, on a people-to-people basis, has served as living evidence of America's desire to share the technological knowledge and modern-day skills which lead to economic and social progress. The Peace Corps has also served as an eminently successful ambassador of good will to the peoples of other lands. It has succeeded on a practical scale beyond our most hopeful expectations. Mr. Sargent Shriver, the Director of the Peace Corps, who was responsible for navigating the strange waters of this new undertaking, certainly is due much credit for its effectiveness. His administration has been exemplary not only in the history of foreign aid programs but in the history of Government administration itself.

President Johnson is to be commended upon having named Mr. Shriver to lead another new venture as Administrator of the Economic Opportunity Act designed to help Americans who up to now have been hemmed in by the barriers of poor and opportunity-shy environments and predict that Mr. Shriver will administer

this new program with the same dynamism and proud results which have typified the Peace Corps during the past 4 years.

AMENDING INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 45) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. PATMAN, MULTER, BARRETT, SULLIVAN, REUSS, ASHLEY, WIDNALL, FINO, and HALPERN.

SPECIAL DAY IN HONOR OF DR. ROBERT HUTCHINGS GODDARD

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 301) to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 301

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds that rapid advances and developments in the fields of astronautics and related sciences are having an increasing impact on the daily lives of the people, the national security, and long-range human progress. It is therefore desirable and appropriate that steps be taken to promote greater public knowledge of the progress and achievement being brought about in these fields, and for that purpose to provide for special recognition and honor to Doctor Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics, and to designate and set aside a special day to honor his memory and his accomplishments.

SEC. 2. (a) The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in the fields of astronautics and related sciences by providing for appropriate ceremonies, meetings, and other activities on March 16 of each year, a day to be known and celebrated as Goddard Day in honor of the epochal achievements in these fields by the late Doctor Robert Hutchings Goddard.

(b) The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government and

the public to participate in the ceremonies, meetings, and other activities held in observance of Goddard Day.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer several committee amendments, and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

On page 2, lines 6 through 8 strike the following: "promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in the fields of astronautics and related sciences by providing", and insert in lieu thereof the word "provide".

On page 2, line 10, strike the following: "of each year, a", and insert in lieu thereof "1965, said".

On page 2, line 14, strike the word "annually".

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly urge this House to unanimously and immediately approve S. 301, as amended, because I very deeply believe it is one of the most meritorious legislative proposals ever presented to this House.

The summary purpose of this bill is to provide for the designation of March 16, 1965, as Goddard Day and to be known and celebrated as such in honor of the late Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rocketry.

At the early age of 17, Dr. Goddard had visions of an airship, rocket propelled, flying through space. With persevering faith and diligence, despite continued disappointments and even public ridicule, Dr. Goddard, in the town of Auburn, Mass., on March 16, 1926, successfully launched the first liquid-fuel rocket in world history. This first successful experiment formed the basis of the great U.S. developments in solid propellant rockets in the Second World War and it was the forerunner of continued and persistent research by Dr. Goddard leading to the advanced space age accomplishments we boast of today.

Dr. Goddard was the first modern man of science who recognized the potentiality of rockets and space flight and concentrated his energy upon the almost overwhelming task of nourishing them to practical fulfillment. Everyone in the world today acknowledges his work and his efforts in space flight experiment as among the most important technical accomplishments of our times marking as they do a turning point in the history of man.

Dr. Robert H. Goddard was born in my home city of Worcester, Mass., and was graduated from Worcester Polytechnic Institute there. This year, in the 100th anniversary of its existence, Worcester Polytechnic Institute is devoting a special program, on March 16,

next, to commemorate the memory of Dr. Goddard.

Beyond other pertinent factors, it is most fitting that this House expedite approval of this bill today so that it may be finally enacted into law in time to be included as part of the special commemorative program being conducted on March 16, 1965, by Worcester Polytechnic Institute, the great educational institution that inspired and encouraged the scientific talents of a gifted young man whose achievements were destined to generate a whole new era and age of space exploration for a changed and hopefully better world to come.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE OF OBJECTORS, CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement on the rules of operations of the Consent Calendar members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important procedures that the House follows in considering legislation is known as the Consent Calendar operation. It is under this procedure that most of the acts of Congress which become public laws are considered by the House of Representatives.

It has been the practice heretofore of the members of the Consent Calendar committees—the majority members and the minority members—to agree upon rules of procedure at the beginning of a session. I would suggest, to the new Members especially, that they read the statement, which has the approval of and bears the initials of all the members of the Consent Calendar committees, three members of the majority and three members of the minority.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT ON RULES OF OPERATION OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR MEMBERS

On February 3 and February 8, respectively, the majority and minority floor leaders appointed their respective personnel of the objectors committees, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT, appointed three members of his party and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, appointed three members of his party. The objectors committees are unofficial committees of the House of Representatives, existing at the request and at the pleasure of the respective floor leaders of the two parties who, in order to facilitate the proper screening of legislation which may be placed on the Consent Calendar, designate Members of each side of the aisle charged with the specific responsibility of seeing to it that legislation passing by such procedure is in the interest of good government. The rule which is applicable to Consent Calendar procedure is clause 4 of rule XIII, found in section 746 of the rules of the House of Representatives. The operation of such procedure is described in Cannon's Procedures in the House of Representatives.

For several sessions now objectors on both sides of the aisle have followed certain rules for consideration of Consent Calendar bills which they have made known to the Members at the beginning of a session. These rules are not publicized at this time to establish hard-and-fast procedures but rather to advise the Members of the House as to the manner in which the committee plans to operate throughout the 89th Congress.

The members of the committees feel that generally no legislation should pass by unanimous consent which involves an aggregate expenditure of more than \$1 million; second, that no bill which changes national policy or international policy should be permitted to pass on the Consent Calendar but rather should be afforded the opportunity of open and extended debate; third, that any bill which appears on the Consent Calendar, even though it does not change national or international policy, or does not call for an expenditure of more than \$1 million, should not be approved without the membership being fully informed of its contents, providing it is a measure that would apply to the districts of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, in which case the minimum amount of consideration that should be given such a bill would be clearance by the leadership of both parties being brought before the House on the Consent Calendar.

It has been the policy of the objectors on the Consent Calendar heretofore to put such a bill over without prejudice one or more times to give an opportunity to the Members to become fully informed as to the contents of such a bill, and the Consent Calendar objectors for the 89th Congress wish to follow like procedure; fourth, that if a bill has been placed on the Consent Calendar and the members of the committee having jurisdiction over the legislation show that it has not been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, by the respective Departments affected by such legislation, or that such reports from the committee or from the Department show that the legislation is not in accord with the President's program, it should not pass on the Consent Calendar but that the chairman of the House committee having jurisdiction over the legislation should either call it up under suspension of the rules with the permission of the Speaker or should go to the Rules Committee for a rule for such legislation. While the members of the objectors' committees feel that a report from the Bureau of the Budget is necessary before a bill should be placed upon the Consent Calendar, they do not wish to take the position that the report from the Bureau of the Budget must necessarily show the approval of such legislation by the Bureau. However, if such approval is not shown, then in the consideration of the legislation, even if considered on the Consent Calendar, the chairman reporting the bill, or the sponsor of the bill, should be willing to accept the responsibility of stating to the Members the action of the Bureau of the Budget and the reasons for such action.

The members of the Consent Calendar objectors' committee also feel it fair to state to the membership that it is not their purpose to obstruct legislation or to object to bills or pass them over without prejudice because of any personal objection to said bill or bills by any one member or all of the members of the Consent Calendar objectors' committee, but rather that their real purpose, in addition to expediting legislation, is to protect the membership against having bills passed by unanimous consent which, in the opinion of the objectors, any Member of the House might have objection to.

The members of the Consent Calendar objectors committee earnestly request that the chairman of the standing committees of the House having the responsibility for bringing legislation before the House take into

consideration the contents of this statement before placing bills on the Consent Calendar. While it is not absolutely necessary that the sponsors of bills appearing on the Consent Calendar contact the various members of the Consent Calendar objectors committee, nevertheless, in the interest of saving time and avoiding the possibility of having bills laid over unnecessarily, it is good practice to do so; and the objectors welcome the continuance of the procedure of getting in touch with them at least 24 hours before the legislation is called up under the regular Consent Calendar procedure. In many instances such thoughtfulness on the part of the sponsors will clear away questions which the objectors have and consequently will make for the expeditious handling of legislation.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JOHN J. McFALL,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Majority Objectors.
THOMAS M. PELLY,
DURWARD G. HALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
Minority Objectors.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

MODIFYING THE FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT ON THE SCIOTO RIVER, OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2208) to modify the flood control project on the Scioto River, Ohio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2208

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction: Provided, That in the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document No. 587, Eighty-seventh Congress: And provided further, That the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODIFYING THE FOUR RIVER BASINS PROJECT, FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4606) to modify the flood control project for Four River Basins, Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note that depart-

ment reports are not printed in the committee report on this legislation. It has been stressed in previous Congresses, by both Democratic and Republican objectors, that the committee should have the department reports included in the committee report.

In this case, Mr. Speaker, the committee has stated that with similar legislation in the 88th Congress, the Department of the Army and the Bureau of the Budget had no objection to the legislation, so I am not going to ask that the bill be passed over, but I would like to point up the necessity for committee chairmen, when reporting bills, to include the department reports in the report on the bills.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I join with the gentleman from Washington in pointing out that there are no detailed reports from the departments with respect to this legislation.

I would further point out that last year, when this bill was before the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERARD R. FORD] and the gentleman from Iowa presently addressing the House made the point that there were no departmental reports.

Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot agree that bills on the Consent Calendar—or any other bills—should be considered in this session of the Congress without proper and detailed departmental reports.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I believe the gentleman will note from the report of the committee that the Department of the Army recommended enactment of a similar bill in the last session, with certain amendments, and those amendments have been incorporated in the bill now before the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of that. I have read the report and I am well aware of what the report says, and it does not conform to the accepted practice of having detailed reports from the departments.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I am opposed to this bill. It went through under unanimous consent last year. But I cannot stand by without protest to see this procedure started in this session of Congress.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will my friend from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand it, this is an identical bill to the one which passed in the House during the 88th Congress, and there has been no change in the position of the Department of the Army Engineers on this legislation.

I believe the history which has been made—that there has been no change—should satisfy my friend from Iowa.

I am in complete agreement with the position my friend takes, with the exception that this bill is similar to the one which passed in the 88th Congress, and

there has been no objection from the department having jurisdiction.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman agree with me that the issue was made last year, that the absence of departmental reports was noted last year, and that there has been ample time, and more than ample time, for those interested in this legislation to produce departmental reports?

Mr. ASPINALL. I would agree with my colleague from Iowa, but I believe under the circumstances, with this admonition we are giving, there will not be any trespass upon this procedure in the future.

Mr. GROSS. And will the gentleman on the majority side and others on the panel on the Consent Calendar on the majority side join with me in this?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado now speaking is one of the originators of this idea that we should have departmental reports and in any other case, with this notice being given to our colleagues, I will certainly join with my friend.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Colorado is very persuasive, and with that assurance, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4606

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the flood control project for Four River Basins, Florida, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to the remaining features of such project for any work done by such interests on the Lake Tarpon Basin feature of the project after July 1, 1963, if he approves such work as being in accordance with such project as authorized: Provided, That such credit shall not exceed the Federal share of this feature of the project, presently estimated at \$1,255,300.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 25]

Andrews,	Dickinson	Grabowski
Glenn	Diggs	Griffin
Bolling	Dulski	Gurney
Bonner	Findley	Hagen, Calif.
Celler	Fino	Halleck
Cohelan	Fraser	Halpern
Coyers	Frelinghuysen	Hanna
Derwinski	Gonzalez	Hardy

Hays	Monagan	Stalbaum
Helstoski	Morton	Sullivan
Holland	O'Brien	Sweeney
Karsten	Olsen, Mont.	Teague, Tex.
Kastenmeier	Patman	Tuck
Kelly	Pickle	Tupper
King, N.Y.	Powell	Widnall
Kluczynski	Rivers, Alaska	Willis
Kornegay	Roosevelt	Wilson,
Long, Md.	Roudebush	Charles H.
Mailliard	Selden	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 249 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 249

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, the text of the bill (H.R. 4466) as an amendment to the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of S. 3, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule calls for the consideration of the so-called Appalachian legislation. It provides for open rule and 4 hours debate.

I wish to commend the Committee on Public Works for the outstanding service they have rendered in presenting to the Congress this comprehensive legislation to further the development of the most economically stricken area in our Nation. The Appalachia area, if given the opportunity to develop its economy, has more natural resources and advantages through its potential industrial complex—minerals, forest, mines, agriculture, waterpower—than any similar area in our Nation. When this legislation is enacted into law, it will directly benefit the economic welfare of 15½ million people.

This legislation will combine the efforts of the Federal Government and the Governors and appointed commissions of their States to collectively aid and restore prosperity to millions of families in an area 10 times the size of Switzerland.

This bill has been brought about by reason of the joint effort of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations during the past several years. Many meetings have been held by representatives of the Federal Government and the various Appalachian States, before the completed study of the Appalachian Committee was submitted to the Congress for action.

The prime goal of the Appalachian program is that all public investments made in the region under this act shall be concentrated in areas where there is a significant potential for future growth, and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be greatest.

This legislation was enacted by the other body a few weeks ago by a majority of 2½ to 1. It covers parts of 10 States and the entire State of West Virginia.

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

The major development of this legislation will be creating a system of main roads and highways, and also access lines of transportation for local residents as well as main highway transportation through the complete area. The heavy concentration on road construction in this bill is to accomplish not just the opening up of Appalachia to the rest of the Nation, but also to assure commuting to and from work for the local citizens. Some \$840 million will be allotted for 2,300 miles of main highways and 1,000 miles of local access roads. States will contribute \$360 million of this highway development.

EDUCATION

An extended program to expand vocational education will be placed in certain areas and locations because of high unemployment. Millions in this area have not had the opportunity to secure a basic educational training and also an opportunity to learn trade and craft skills, without which the unemployed are greatly handicapped to secure a job. There is heavy demand all over the country by industrialists, builders, businessmen, and contractors for trained workers. The vast percentage of unemployed today are citizens who never had an opportunity to learn a craft that demands skill and training. Since the end of World War II, technological advances in mining, heavy industry, and agriculture have contributed most to the unemployment problems which plague Appalachia today.

STATE CONTROL

One of the outstanding features of this legislation is that all projects under this bill will be in control of the Governors of the respective States or the various departments within the State government.

HEALTH

The hospital and medical services in our Nation have been a major factor in the progress we have enjoyed. Without said services, no community or subregion can hope to attract modern industry. In many sections of Appalachia, this problem of health is acute. The low income of these sections makes unavailable access to private medicine and the tax base to provide for public health facilities is nonexistent. From the health angle, this legislation will be a godsend to the people of these areas.

FORESTS AND COAL MINING

The hardwood forests of Appalachia were at one time counted among the Nation's most precious assets. House construction for generations had its primary lumber sources supplied from this area. It is estimated that 70 percent of the region's forest acres are held by individuals who possess 50 acres or less. Such small individual holdings make it almost impossible to improve the timber quality of the forests. The bill provides agreements to establish nonprofit timber development organizations, chartered under State law, which will permit a cooperative effort at better management. Five million dollars will be set aside for loans to timber development organizations to improve cutting and marketing of timber.

Special attention must be directed toward the unlimited bituminous coal deposits in this area. Coal is their largest single resource. Owing to a shrinking market and automation, mining operations have been curtailed and thousands have lost their jobs. The Federal and State Governments combined can greatly encourage the market for fuel and the expanded production of coal. Some \$36 million will be authorized area restoration but the Federal Government cooperation will be limited to 75 percent of project costs.

LAND CONSERVATION

The bill authorizes \$17 million in grants for soil conservation, erosion control, and land improvement purposes. Federal contribution limited to 80 percent and also a 50-acre limitation.

WATER RESOURCES AND SEWAGE TREATMENT

With proper control and management, Appalachia's water resources can become the region's most precious national asset, providing almost unlimited opportunities for recreational activities and incentives for industrial development.

Industrial waste treatment, through the lack of sewage treatment facilities, is a serious Appalachian problem and threatens the health of its people and discourages economic development. This bill provides that funds will be expended without regard to the national authorization ceiling or the allotment ceiling for each State contained in the Water Pollution Control Act.

URBAN PLANNING

This legislation will provide an urban planning program in order to assist State and local governments in solving their municipal problems resulting from the increasing concentration of population in metropolitan and other urban areas. This will include coordinating transportation systems and other related problems concerning urban growth. The bill provides for a termination of this legislation on July 1, 1971.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST OTHER AREAS

Opposition to this legislation was heard before the Rules Committee hearings that this legislation would discriminate against other areas of the Nation. We all remember during the first two terms of President Franklin Roosevelt the criticism that expenditures, to aid areas in expanding their economy and provide employment, would ruin our

Government's financial stability. Any program that expands industry and production and provides jobs also furnishes money and buying power for millions to keep the factories and mills working and to buy the farmer's products. The last 30 years have demonstrated that this expansion has contributed to our present prosperity. During the days of the depression in the early thirties, our gross national product was around \$50 billion. Today, our national product or economy is around \$620 billion and Secretary Dillon states that before the end of 1965 it will be \$660 billion. After World War II, our national production was approximately only \$211 billion. These facts alone should discount and refute all the arguments that have been heard on the floor of this House during the last 25 years in opposition to this type of legislation.

With restoring a prosperous economy to the 15-odd-million people in Appalachia it will help all industry and production located in all parts of our Nation.

It will expand the automobile industry. The increased purchase of cars in a prosperous Appalachia would expand the steel production in the Indiana Calumet region, Pittsburgh, Birmingham, Chicago, California, and other areas. Rubber and oil industry would feel the best expansion from a prosperous Appalachia. Refrigerators, farm machinery, tractors, wagons, clothing, building materials, food, and other of life's necessities would be in far greater demand and every town over the Nation would directly or indirectly enjoy the buying power of 15 million people in the Appalachian area.

I think it is time for all the members of this House to realize how important it is to expand the buying power of more millions of our citizens because that makes for more prosperity and it also calls for added millions of taxes into the Federal treasury.

This is an economic income producing and employment bill that will further contribute to the expansion of our economy and national production. This bill is a small blueprint of the legislation initiated in the middle thirties which eventually expanded our gross national product up to \$625 billion in 25 years. Economy experts all agree that if this prosperity continues we will have a gross national product in 1977 of about \$900 billion annually.

Our Nation learned an unforgettable lesson during the depression of 30 years ago. Our economy was ruined because millions of families were without buying power by reason of low wages and unemployment. This Appalachian legislation will eventually create production, employment, and buying power. It will bring added millions in taxes into the Federal treasury when Appalachia is restored. It will be a major program to make a reality of the economist's prediction of a gross national production of \$900 billion in the next dozen years.

Members should remain on the floor and vote against any crippling amendments to this necessary economical legislation.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 249 provides for an open rule, with 4 hours of debate for the consideration of S. 3 which is entitled "Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965." The rule also makes in order as a substitute H.R. 4466, a bill entitled "The Resources Development Act of 1965" which was introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. Incidentally, the word can be pronounced Appa-lay-chian, or Appal-latch-ian according to the dictionary.

S. 3 is an extensive, quite complicated, and controversial measure. I call your attention to the minority views starting on page 33 of the report which are signed by 9 members; to the additional views commencing on page 59 signed by 5 members; and to the additional views of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] on page 76.

S. 3 would establish a special massive Federal assistance program for the so-called Appalachian region which consists of 360 counties in 11 States. The 11 States are Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, and New York. The bill establishes an Appalachian Regional Commission, consisting of one representative from each of the 11 States, who will be the Governor or someone appointed by him, and a Federal representative who will be Cochairman. This Commission is authorized to develop plans and programs, and establish priorities for projects under the bill, and no Federal grant-in-aid or assistance program or project provided for in S. 3 can be implemented until plans therefor have been recommended by the Commission. Any decision made by the Commission requires the affirmative vote of a majority of the State members.

The major portion of the bill, which accounts for 77 percent of the funds authorized, is for the establishment of a new Appalachian development highway system, to consist of 2,350 miles, and the construction of an additional 1,000 miles of local access roads, for which \$840 million is authorized to be appropriated to pay up to 70 percent of the cost of construction. An additional \$252,400,000 would be authorized to be appropriated to defray the Federal costs for the first 2 years of other programs contained in the bill, which include the construction and operation of health facilities; a program for land stabilization, conservation and erosion control; technical assistance and loans for timber development organizations; the restoration and rehabilitation of mining areas and for a nationwide study relative to rehabilitation of strip and surface mining throughout the United States; a comprehensive water resources survey of the Appalachian region to be made by the Secretary of the Army; construction of vocational education facilities and sewage treatment works, a reenacted accelerated public works program for the Appalachian region alone, which would increase to 80 percent the Federal share of the cost of construction or equipment of facilities under all Federal-aid programs author-

ized by this bill, and such other programs provided for in existing law, except for the construction of highways, for which funds are available under the act authorized by such program; and, for certain administrative expenses and research and demonstration projects.

The total Federal funds authorized by the bill is \$1,092,200,000; however, this amount will finance the program provided for in the legislation, other than highways, for only the first 2 years, and additional funds will have to be authorized in the future for the remaining 4 years of this 6-year program. The administration has been unable to estimate what the total cost of this program will be over the 6-year period; however, some have suggested that it may be as much as \$4 billion.

Last year the other body passed a bill quite similar to the one under consideration here today. The House did not act. You may recall that during the campaign statements were made that this program would be one of the first orders of business this session. So, at least to some extent, we are being called upon to consider this measure because of administration campaign promises.

Every one of us sincerely hopes that no citizen will live in poverty, that every State will prosper, and that no areas will suffer if we can avoid it. But to select certain areas and attempt to lift them up whereby they will be on a par with other areas, simply by taxing and spending money from the other areas, seems to me to be an impossible thing to do.

In my opinion, this is a bad bill for the following reasons:

First. It would provide preferential treatment for one region of the United States, and thereby discriminate against all other areas of the Nation, some of which have equal or greater poverty, unemployment, and lack of economic development.

Second. There are no standards, based upon need, for determination of the eligibility of areas within Appalachia for which Federal assistance may be provided, and the bill provides assistance for prosperous as well as depressed counties. Seventy-six of the 360 counties do not qualify as eligible areas under the Area Redevelopment Act or the Public Works Acceleration Act.

Third. The Appalachian Regional Commission could be federally dominated by the Federal Cochairmen, whose vote on the Commission is equal to that of the 11 States, thereby giving him complete veto power over all programs and projects to be authorized by this bill. This places State and local officials in a subservient position to this Federal czar if they wish to get programs and projects approved.

Fourth. The highway program is particularly discriminatory against other parts of the country, for it authorizes an additional highway program for the Appalachian region alone, which is almost as large as the annual program for construction of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways and their urban extensions in all of the 50 States, in which regular program Appalachia already participates.

Fifth. It provides 80 percent Federal grants for land improvement, which would increase cropland and pastureland production, and promote uneconomic farm units, at a time when there is an overproduction of beef and crops in the country, and when the Government is paying farmers to take other and more productive land out of production.

Sixth. It reenacts the objectionable and ineffective Public Works Acceleration Act program, as applied to the Appalachian region, by increasing to 80 percent the Federal share of the cost of projects for which Federal grants-in-aid are provided for the construction or equipment of facilities under this bill and other existing Federal grants-in-aid programs, except for the construction of highways, which is even an increase over the 50- to 75-percent Federal share made available under the Public Works Acceleration Act.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, the rule will make it in order to substitute the language of H.R. 4466, the Resources Development Act of 1965, which is printed in the report of the Committee on Public Works on S. 3, commencing on page 60.

This substitute attempts to avoid the objectionable features of the Appalachian bill. It would extend Federal financial assistance to all areas throughout the United States which qualify as eligible areas under the Public Works Acceleration Act or the Area Redevelopment Act, and not just to a single project or to a prosperous advanced area.

It would authorize programs and projects to be initiated by State and local officials and to be administered by existing Federal officials, rather than creating a new Federal regional level of government that would have the ultimate control over programs and projects.

The substitute bill would authorize the appropriation of funds, with varying State matching requirements, for the period ending June 1967, for the following purposes and amounts of money:

	Millions
Economic development highways.....	\$800
Demonstration health facilities.....	82
Timber development organizations....	10
Mining area restoration.....	43
Water resource study.....	5
Vocational education facilities.....	32
Sewage treatment works.....	12
Grants for administrative expenses of local development districts and for research and development projects...	11
Total.....	995

Mr. Speaker, if we embark on this new program for Appalachia, I wonder how long it will be before there will be similar programs requested for other so-called depressed areas, such as the Ozarks, or parts of the Northwest United States and other regions. We could eventually have several regional commissions operating in various parts of the United States, all in conflict and in duplication with existing Federal programs. How long will it then be until supply and demand, competition, and our free enterprise system will become things of the past? Certainly the nondepressed areas are having their tax problems today on a local, coun-

ty, and State level. Are we going to eventually destroy them and have the entire United States turned into a depressed area?

I do not know the answer Mr. Speaker, but I am concerned over a program such as this. I think it is wrong. But if the majority so desires, it seems that the substitute, which is a proposed nationwide measure, treating labor and depressed areas alike, is preferable to the Appalachian bill.

I understand that some 18 amendments were offered in the committee, that none were accepted, and that S. 3 was practically "steamrolled" through. I assume many of these amendments will be offered here.

I know of no objection to the rule, Mr. Speaker, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today on the floor of the House for consideration one of the most ill-conceived bills that has ever come before this body. The measure that is before us today was adopted in the Senate, sent over to the House, and after only 3 days of hearings in the Public Works Committee was reported out of that committee without the acceptance of a single amendment.

As a consequence, passage of this bill by this body will immediately send the legislation to the White House. It will not go to conference, and you will not have another opportunity to vote on this measure.

I want to confine my remarks today to two sections of the bill, section 202 in regard to health facilities, and section 203 in regard to land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control.

Section 202 in regard to health facilities, Mr. Speaker, sets up a 100-percent socialized medical program in the United States, notwithstanding the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means, the committee which is properly charged with jurisdiction in this field, has had extensive hearings on this subject and is currently in the process of marking up a bill.

Under the provisions of section 202, \$41 million would be authorized to be appropriated for the construction of hospitals and health facilities, and \$21 million would be authorized to be appropriated to take care of the operating expenses—bear that in mind, the cost of the operation of these hospitals.

What does this mean? I asked the chairman of the subcommittee in our hearings before the Rules Committee last week what "operation" meant. I said, "If some people came into one of these hospitals and they did not have sufficient funds to take care of their expenses, are they going to get free hospitalization, free doctor's care, free operations, free drugs, free medicine?"

Do you know what the reply was? "Yes, that is exactly what this bill would do."

Mr. Speaker, we are going all the way in this legislation. We are not going the limited way that the King-Anderson bill proposes, we are going all the way down the road to 100-percent socialized

medicine in section 202 of this bill. This section should be deleted before final passage.

Let me talk to you about section 203. This is the part of the bill that has been changed somewhat, but only in a minor way, from the legislation that was before us last year passed by the Senate but on which no action was taken by this body. This was H.R. 11946 which was considered in the 88th Congress.

Let me read to you one or two lines from section 203 in the bill that we considered last year:

Conveyance to any landowner under this section shall not exceed 80 per centum of the cost of improving or developing twenty-five acres of pasture land owned by said landowner.

Let me read to you the bill under consideration, S. 3. This is on page 18, line 20:

Provided, That grants hereunder shall not exceed 80 per centum of the cost of carrying out such land uses and conservation treatment on fifty acres of land occupied by such owner, operator, or occupier.

What have they done? They have doubled the amount of land which can be assisted under this program up to 80 percent of the cost. In the bill last year, the benefits were to accrue only to the owner, but this year that has been enlarged also. In addition to the owner, the operator or the occupier of the land may qualify for this 80 percent grant.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I am sorry, I do not have much time left.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to ask, What is an "occupier"?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I do not know. We would call him a renter out in our country in Nebraska; but that is the language of the bill, "owner, operator, or occupier." So you can see the terms of this section of the bill have been greatly broadened.

There was a great deal of talk last year that this particular section of the bill, and it is so stated in the report, was going to lead to the introduction of a cattle industry in the Appalachian region; in fact, it was hoped and predicted that eventually a million head of cattle would be brought into this area. Now we have had a change in the wording of the bill this year. We have had some changes in the wording of the report accompanying the bill. We have been assured by some of the members of the Public Works Committee that we need have no fear in this regard. Let me read from this report. This is on page 14:

If the land of the Appalachian region is to play a role in the improvement of the economic level of the area, the acreage which currently is submarginal must be provided with a productive vegetative cover and other treatment measures in order to check its deterioration.

On page 15 of the report, it is stated:

The problem in Appalachia is fundamentally one of erosion of the hillsides. Such practices as terracing, upstream tanks, flood-control ponds, and the planting of leguminous crops can be of great long-range benefit.

I checked the definition "leguminous crops" and this is what it says in the dictionary:

Any plant of the family leguminosae especially one used for feed, food, or soil improving crops.

Feed is used by livestock, by animals. Page 15 specifically says they are going to cover this area that has been denuded with protective cover. This is alfalfa, clover, and other grasses in that same category. It is only used for one purpose, to graze livestock, cattle. We have had a doubling of the number of acres in this bill over the bill we had last year, from 25 to 50 acres. The report on the bill last year stated that they are hoping to bring in a million head of cattle into the Appalachian region and to build up a cattle industry. They have doubled the acreage. Perhaps they hope to bring in 2 million cattle in the coming years under this program.

We have a very serious situation in the livestock industry today. We not only have overproduction, but we have tremendous imports of meat and beef from foreign countries that have drastically depressed the price of beef and cattle in our American market, and our cattlemen are faced with disastrous losses. Yet here we are to the tune of a \$17 million subsidy going to set up a livestock industry in the Appalachian region under the terms of section 203 in competition with our ranchers and our feeders in private enterprise who are operating on their own funds under the American free enterprise system.

This is wrong, Mr. Speaker. I hope this section is taken out of the bill, and if that is not possible, I hope an amendment is adopted to prohibit specifically the use of any of this grassland that is planted under this program from being grazed by livestock, so that we need have absolutely no fear of any competition from the Appalachia region.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state at the outset of my remarks that the rule which has been granted for the consideration of the Appalachia bill is quite fair. I would also like to say that the majority of the public works ad hoc special committee that considered this legislation was also extremely fair in treating the minority and differing opinions on this legislation.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I cannot say that this legislative proposal itself is fair. I wish to speak on several points by which I will underscore the essential unfairness of this act.

THE NAME OF THE GAME IS PREFERENTIAL

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to state the fact that this is unfair legislation from my lips. I would like to quote you from the record of our hearings on page 42, Mr. Sweeney, Chairman of the Federal Development Planning Committee for Appalachia:

The name of the Appalachian game is preferential treatment.

In black and white the administration's witness has etched the hallmark of this legislation.

What this legislation does is to favor large areas over the small, the big over the small. This has been a regrettable trend in government today which I view with great alarm.

I wonder how many people in this House realize that one-half of the TVA service area is in Appalachia and that one-third of the Appalachia area is in TVA area. I wonder how many people really realize that this bill which is being offered to help the poor and the needy, includes the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., the favored town of Huntsville, Ala., the richest area of Alabama, and the Spartanburg area of South Carolina. Indeed, the wealthiest county of that fair State is located in Appalachia.

LEGISLATION IS UNFAIR

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is unfair. For the first time this House is authorizing the building of national highways on a sectional and discriminatory basis.

Many of you in this House have received letters from people in rural areas protesting the administration's cutting of soil conservation funds. The soil conservation program is designed to help small farmers in small areas. At the same time the administration is cutting soil conservation funds nationally, it is pouring an almost equal amount of money into Appalachia, to beef up soil conservation programs there.

This bill on its face is meant to help small rural communities. But read the transcript of the testimony. The administration openly admits there is no help for the small "ribbon" towns, as they call them in the valleys of Appalachia. The whole theory of the bill is to build up only those wealthy areas where in the terms of the bill there is a significant potential for future growth. In other words, this bill deliberately is encouraging the prosperous areas of Appalachia to become more prosperous.

JOB PIRACY AND INDUSTRIAL PIRACY

This is the essential unfairness of this legislation—by building up these centers of prosperity in Appalachia they help to lure into the Appalachian area more jobs and more industries, and this is why, in my additional views I call this an act of piracy. This is an act of job piracy. It is an act of industrial piracy, because the industries that are lured into the Appalachia area will have to come from someplace, and they are going to come from Indiana, and New Jersey, and New York, and they are going to come from New England; they have to come from somewhere.

The whole purpose of the Appalachia bill is to build the roads, to build the hospitals, to build the sewerage plants, to build the airports, to build the vocational schools, to build the libraries, to develop timber resources, to develop watershed resources, and to develop soil conservation, all with up to 80 percent of Federal money. Thus the area will be so attractive that no industry can refuse a bid to come there. This is why it is an act of job piracy, an act of industrial piracy. This is why the bill is essentially unfair

to those States and communities who also need new industry, but whose own tax dollars are thus financing their competition.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] will be recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I recommend immediate passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. I do so without reservation and with deep conviction—conviction that we all have a great stake in the provisions and purposes of this piece of legislation. For while geographically the Appalachian region may be far removed from many of our districts, economically its problems and, more important, its possibilities, are very close to us all.

For example, the great State of Hawaii is some 5,000 miles from Appalachia. Yet both of that State's Senators, representing different political parties, supported and voted for this bill in the Public Works Committee and on the floor of the Senate. What they saw was that the development of this strategically located region is of great economic importance to the whole country.

Basically, the problem in Appalachia is income level. The per capita income there is some 39 percent below the national average. If Appalachians had the same buying power as the average American, there are few industries in few districts that would not benefit. The 16 million Appalachians could buy more new cars from Detroit, more produce from our farm States, more clothes from the textile industry, and, of course, more products from every State.

But it is not only as a market that Appalachia has potential. For the people and the land there are capable of much industry: the kind of industry best suited to the growth potential of all the parts of the region. As a producer of jobs, products and income, Appalachia has several natural advantages. One of the most important of these is its central location. Appalachia lies between the Boston-Norfolk on the East and the lower Great Lakes population centers on the West. By 1980 these two areas will have a combined population of some 67 million—67 million who will want to tour through the scenic beauty of Appalachia, who will buy Appalachian products, and who will supply Appalachian needs.

But before all this will be possible, much has to be done. The legislation before you now will enable Appalachia to do it. I emphasize the fact that Appalachia will do the job, for this program is not one of support, but one of development. Certainly the resources of the Federal Government are being made available, but in close conjunction with State and local resources. For I believe that the most impressive thing about this program is not the money that will be spent, but the effort that will be organized—on all levels of government.

We have had evidence of this in the two-session history of this legislation. We have heard testimony from more than a dozen departments and agencies of the Federal Government and from the Governors of the 11 Appalachian States. The fact that the program was first requested by the States themselves, and is tailored to their needs, rights, and responsibilities augers well for its success.

Now I am fully aware that sometime during the course of the debate on this bill, someone will say "the Appalachian program discriminates against other regions." If discrimination is defined as helping one region so that all regions will benefit, then this program discriminates. My own district is not in Appalachia, but I know that the port and city of Baltimore will benefit in many ways from an economically active Appalachia.

If conditions in Appalachia are holding down the level of our overall prosperity—and they are—employment, income, and retail sales there are all substantially below the national average—then I do not believe it is discriminatory to take measures that will eliminate such conditions. It is apparent that one way to develop our economy so that it will realize its greatest potential is to develop the lagging economy of Appalachia. In that pursuit Baltimore or New York, Los Angeles, Kansas City, Miami, Detroit, or Seattle all have a significant interest.

I know I speak for many when I say that this program is governmentally proper and progressive and economically sound and essential. There have been some questions asked and objections raised to the provisions of this bill. In its 2-year trip in Congress, all of these have been answered, met and, in many cases, incorporated into the legislation before you now.

It is the consensus of those who proposed, those who drafted, and those who will carry out this program, that it is the best possible answer for the problems and prospects of the Appalachian region.

I specifically invite your attention to those provisions of the bill which fully preserve and utilize the roles, rights, and responsibilities of the States. No project may be initiated in a State without its specific approval. Only the State's representative on the proposed Commission may recommend a project for that State. There is no giving up of State's prerogative to the Federal bureaucracy—indeed, the Appalachian Regional Commission itself is composed of State representatives who will have an equal voice with the Federal Cochairman.

As for the Federal Government, this program requires no new agency or vast bureaucracy to administer it—only a small staff to coordinate the efforts of existing programs and agencies.

And the dollars to be spent? I would characterize them as not massive but modest—and repayable many times over by way of the benefits that will flow from an economically healthy Appalachia.

I believe most of you are familiar with the essential elements of the program embodied in this legislation. I would only stress that in the field of human resources, there is no overlap with the efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The money originally scheduled for this section has been deleted from the bill before you now and has since been made part of the President's war on poverty.

In conclusion, I would like to commend the Governors of the Appalachian States for their initiative and great contributions to this program. I would also commend the President's Appalachian Regional Commission and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., for the tireless effort they have put into the research on, analysis of, and answers to, the problems of Appalachia.

I think it was Benjamin Franklin who once said that "there is nothing so uncommon as commonsense." That is a charge too often made against the Government, but I would emphatically say that this program for Appalachia is the commonsense of economic development. It is the intelligent use of the best that Government can offer to answer the needs of the people it serves. In Appalachia it will mean that a proud and determined people can be a contribution to prosperity and no longer an example of poverty. For I believe that the program in the bill before you now gives Appalachia what it needs most—a future and not just more of the present.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, when the House approves S. 3, a 5-year effort will be completed. This bill had its beginning in 1960 when the first meeting of the conference of Appalachian Governors was called together by Governor Tawes, of Maryland.

The conference of Appalachian Governors studied the problems of the Appalachian region for a period of 3 years—

they then requested the help of the Federal Government to complete the work.

In April of 1963, President Kennedy created the President's Appalachian Regional Commission and directed it to report back to him with a program of action to meet the needs of the people of Appalachia.

One year later the Commission presented its report to President Lyndon B. Johnson. President Johnson's response was immediate. He submitted to the Congress the bill which is now before us, with minor changes worked by the Senate.

This bill is one of the most carefully drawn and well thought out pieces of legislation that I have seen.

It is not a pie-in-the-sky measure.

It is not the product of dreamers, but the product of men and women who have looked carefully at the difficulties this region has faced for more than a century. It contains hard practical solutions to these difficulties.

The Appalachian region stretches from the New York border down through and past the great steel city of Birmingham in my own State of Alabama.

The most striking feature—and the root cause of its more severe problems—is one of the oldest mountain ranges in the world—the Appalachian chain. Beneath those mountains lies some of the richest coal deposits of the world. These deposits have provided this country with more than half of its coal needs.

On the surface of those mountains once stood one of the world's greatest prime hardwood forests. That forest was stripped away to provide the housing and the railroad ties and the mine timbers which have contributed so much to the growth of this Nation.

And on these once heavily forested slopes, one of the highest average rainfalls in the country is deposited.

Scattered among the hollows and the valleys of this mountain range there are more than 16 million people.

Some of them live in the great cities of the region. But most of them live in what the President's Appalachian Regional Commission described as "ribbon towns."

The majority of the Appalachian are classified as rural, yet they do not farm. They are strung out in clusters of population trying the very best way they know how to support themselves and their families.

Because of these 16 million people, an independent people, Appalachia must be looked on as a land of promise—just as this great Nation of ours has always been regarded.

All that is needed to realize the kind of assistance that will enable the Appalachians themselves to solve their own problems.

That is what this bill is intended to provide—a minimum base of assistance upon which the Appalachians can build their own economy and standards of living.

Here are the highlights of this bill. The great mountain chain has been a barrier to commerce and prosperity since the Nation was founded. The settlers who moved west skirted the chain

at the top and bottom or slipped through the mountain gaps to the more fertile land of the West. The first major item in the Appalachian bill is the program of highway construction to overcome the isolation which the mountains have created.

We are asking for an authorization to construct 2,340 miles of major arterial roads to open up regions that now have no access. We also are asking for the construction of 1,000 miles of access roads to link up specific locations with the major highways.

One of the most serious problems which faces the region is its lack of adequate health facilities.

These facilities are needed to attract industry and tourist investment and they are just as important as the highways.

This bill provides a series of construction grants for regional health centers, each of which will serve a cluster of counties. We have also provided funds to meet the deficit in operating costs in the first years of operation of these centers.

The steep slopes of the Appalachian mountains put useful land at a premium. This bill contains three major programs to insure that every square foot of useful land is developed to its fullest potential.

First, we have provided a series of grants to control erosion and promote soil conservation. A landowner may obtain up to 80 percent of the cost of the conservation practices that are essential to restore up to 50 acres of his land, so that it can be used properly.

Second, a series of grants and loans are provided for small landowners to improve their timber stands.

Third, we have drafted a comprehensive program that will assist in restoring land that has been damaged by past mine practices.

Under this program, the voids left by underground mining can be filled in. Underground fires can be extinguished. The refuse piles from past mining can be removed. There are also funds to begin a program of restoring publicly owned lands that have been damaged by past strip mining.

To develop the best possible program for exploiting the heavy annual rainfall in the region, this program authorizes a comprehensive study to be coordinated by the Secretary of the Army with the assistance of all Federal, State, and local agencies.

In the past, most Appalachians have earned their income from three major activities—coal mining, lumbering, and farming. Each of these occupations has declined over the past quarter of a century. Each has declined nationally, but the effects in Appalachia have been particularly severe. That means that new skills must be provided and for that reason we have included in this bill a program that will accelerate the construction of vocational education facilities in Appalachia.

The great rivers and streams of this region offer a great attraction to industry and tourism. In order to provide for a better quality of water in these streams and rivers, we have provided funds to

accelerate and expand the construction of waste treatment plants in Appalachia.

One of the most severe problems in the region is the low tax base in the majority of Appalachian States and communities. This low tax base creates several problems.

First, it prevents the Appalachians from providing for themselves an adequate level of public facilities and public services.

Second, it lessens their ability to take advantage of existing Federal grant-in-aid programs designed to provide those public facilities and services.

The Hill-Burton program of hospital construction is not utilized fully in the region because local matching funds are not available.

Airport construction has been retarded because the States or communities cannot match the program of the Federal Aviation Agency. The same is true in federally assisted programs for colleges and junior college construction, small watershed protection, sewage treatment facilities construction, vocational education school construction, educational television station construction, and other similar Federal grant-in-aid programs.

This bill establishes a fund which can be used to raise the total Federal contribution, within any of these construction and equipment programs, to 80 percent of the cost of the project.

The Appalachian people have taken many steps to raise their own standard of living. But because they do not have the financial means—they cannot obtain for themselves the skilled advice and counsel so necessary in modern America.

This bill provides a series of grants which will enable local communities to hire development specialists to guide them in their own bootstrap efforts. Grants are also provided to undertake economic development research to obtain better answers to the problems facing each section of Appalachia.

Finally, this bill creates an Appalachian Regional Commission. The Commission is charged with the planning and coordination of this new investment program. It will be composed of representatives of the 11 Appalachian States and one Federal member who will speak for the entire Federal Government.

In order to take action the votes of a majority of the State members and the vote of the Federal member are required. Thus the States cannot be imposed upon by the Federal Government. The Federal Government cannot be imposed upon by the States. A mutual purpose—a mutually satisfactory program—is essential.

All projects and proposals for the expenditure of funds under this program must originate with the States. No project and no program can be implemented in a State unless that State approves. In short, Mr. Chairman, this new Commission represents one of the strongest programs I have ever seen in the field of State-Federal relations.

It is a States rights program—it is even more a States responsibilities program. It represents a wise attempt to restore the vitality of our Federal system of Government. I believe it creates the kind of partnership between the States and the Federal Government which we have al-

ways sought but have never quite established.

In explaining the highlights of a bill as comprehensive as this, it is easy to lose sight of the major objective. I have always believed that politics and government can only have one objective. I believe that objective can be simply stated. We hold public office to insure that people have the means, the tools, the instruments, which will enable them to develop their full potential and to live a life of dignity.

I believe that this bill does that and only that. It is not a handout. It is rather a hand held out. It offers encouragement and promise. It is a hand which I believe will be grasped by the people of this region and in so grasping they will be able to pull themselves up a life of dignity and self-respect.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman and congratulate him on his very lucid statement on this bill. I also commend him on the fine job he has done in bringing this bill to the floor of the House today. The gentleman, of course, for many years has been a constructive and outstanding member of the great Committee on Public Works. This bill which he is managing today is evidence of the character and quality of his service.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am very pleased that the majority leader has made the remarks he has made about the outstanding legislative job that has been done in connection with this program by the gentleman from Alabama who is in the well of the House today. The hearings which were conducted on this particular program were hearings that lasted late into the day. The sessions that were conducted to mark up this bill were long and the discussions were often complicated. The feelings of the committee members in connection with this bill were very strong on a number of points in connection with it. The gentleman from Alabama did an outstanding job as the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this legislation. He demonstrated great tact, great understanding, and great firmness throughout the hearings and during the markup of the bill. Every citizen of the Appalachian region owes a great debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] for the statesmanlike job he has done in connection with this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman is very kind. I would like to say that all the members of the committee were attentive and they worked as carefully as they could, both on the Democratic and the Republican side of the committee. It was a refreshing experience to me to serve as chairman of a subcommittee which has such devoted, understanding, and dedicated people in

the consideration of this major piece of legislation.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLODY. I am not familiar with the gentleman's chairmanship of the subcommittee which held hearings on this particular piece of legislation, but I do know intimately of the gentleman's chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. I know of the gentleman's thorough investigation of the subject of water pollution and the subject of our water resources not only in the area of Appalachia but throughout the Nation.

I am particularly interested in the presentation that was made on the subject of the abandoned mines in this area. I do know the gentleman's concern about the problem of pollution as a result of acid mine drainage. I was wondering whether a program for combating or reducing acid mine drainage in this area is provided in this legislation. It is my understanding that most of the acid mine drainage pollution, at least the most serious conditions are in the area now covered by this legislation. I would like to know whether or not this legislation provides a program dealing with this problem.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. As the gentleman from Illinois well knows, we had information from the Department of the Interior last year to the effect that they had under study at that time the problem of acid mine drainage, particularly in West Virginia and Pennsylvania. That study will be extended under the terms of this bill. The conclusions of the Department of the Interior have not been formulated as of this moment. That is our information at least.

Mr. McCLODY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has consumed 21 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill was before the House Committee on Public Works last year. It went from the Committee on Public Works to the House Committee on Rules last year and after rather exhaustive hearings before the Committee on Rules last year, it was not acted upon by the Committee on Rules. This year, of course, it is again before the House.

In my opinion, the bill which has come before the House is a basically discriminatory bill.

I would like to use this map to show why. This map shows in the dark green areas, the areas that qualify under the Area Redevelopment Act, section 5(a) for special financial relief under the area redevelopment bill. Those are the dark areas. You will see many of them in northern Michigan and northern Wisconsin and up in northern Idaho and northern Washington and in the lumber regions of California and other areas.

This map also shows, in the lighter green, the areas which qualify under the Area Redevelopment Act for special financial assistance for agricultural areas when their average income is not as high as it otherwise should be.

Members will see these lighter green areas in a large part of the State of Mississippi, a considerable part of the State of Texas, a large part of the State of Oklahoma and other States, as well as a great part of New Mexico and Arizona and many other areas, such as the northern part of Michigan. Those qualify under this particular section.

The third area on the map is shown in yellow, or perhaps orange would be a more appropriate description. These are the areas which qualify under the Accelerated Public Works Act for special financial assistance.

I might say that the Accelerated Public Works Act by its formula includes in its coverage all those areas which fall under the ARA bill plus additional areas which have what is termed excess or surplus unemployment. So the areas in gold or in yellow are those beyond the scope of the ARA bill that were also covered by the public works acceleration bill. Therefore, we find a considerable number in New England and a considerable number scattered through California. I might say there are none in my district, but some in other parts of California. There are a number in Oregon, Wyoming, and elsewhere, and a number all through the Southern States.

In my opinion, the discrimination in this particular bill is that this bill, the Appalachia bill, states that the only area under the bill which is entitled to the relief described in the bill is the specifically defined area defined as "Appalachia," with all the counties that fall within that defined area, no matter what may be their own individual qualities from the standpoint of surplus unemployment.

As it happens, therefore, an area which has just as high a degree of unemployment in northern Michigan or in northern Wisconsin or in the State of Washington or in the lumber region of the State of California, or perhaps even a higher degree of unemployment, cannot qualify for the various special benefit programs which the areas within the defined area of Appalachia can qualify for.

But there is an even worse problem of discrimination involved in this bill. It is not only true that areas with equal unemployment outside of Appalachia cannot qualify for the same benefits the areas in Appalachia can qualify for, if they have similar unemployment, but also there are today more than 70 counties in Appalachia which do not qualify under any of those programs—the ARA programs, either section 5a or section 5b, or the accelerated public works program.

If Members have copies of the committee report which we put out on the Appalachia bill, they will find on page 57 a list of the counties which do not qualify under any of these programs as counties that would qualify under ARA or APW; and they, in the last tabulation, February 10, 1965, total 76 in num-

ber out of 360 counties within the defined definition of Appalachia.

Let me tell Members what those 76 counties nevertheless can do. Those 76 counties are in themselves not depressed. In themselves they do not meet the test of ARA. In themselves they do not meet the test of accelerated APW. Those 76 counties in themselves are not depressed and, I might say, included in those 76 counties is the county in South Carolina which has the highest per capita income in the State, the county in Alabama which has the highest per capita income in the State, counties in Tennessee which the Governor of Tennessee before our committee last year acknowledged were not depressed, counties in Virginia which the official representative of the State of Virginia before our committee last year testified were not depressed—in fact, he said that some of them had practically the lowest rate of unemployment in the United States. Those 76 counties which do not have surplus unemployment and are not depressed nevertheless under the terms of the bill can qualify for all these special benefit programs, extra funds, and other items.

Let me say that all of these counties can qualify anyway under the antipov-erty bill and all of these counties can qualify under the vocational education bill and all of these counties can qualify anyway under the manpower retraining bill. But these 76 counties which are in themselves not depressed, besides qualifying under all of those programs, can come in and get a second layer of benefits. They can get additional library aid, additional airport aid, and additional aid for construction of sewers that your counties cannot get if you happen to come from States outside of Appalachia, even though your counties may be depressed and therefore appear as a green-colored or gold-colored county on this map.

This is rank discrimination to me to say that a county which has a deep green category, with excess unemployment, or a deep gold category, with excess unemployment, located in upper Michigan or upper Minnesota or in Wyoming or in Oregon or Washington or the lumber region of California, has to pay special additional taxes in order to make it possible for 76 counties within the defined definition of Appalachia to get this special aid even though these 76 counties themselves are not depressed and do not meet the test of a depressed area. It is discrimination to give them a second separate layer of assistance which they are not rightfully entitled and should not receive. In my opinion, this is rank discrimination, and I do not think it should occur.

Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment in the committee to restrict the application of this bill only to those counties in Appalachia which met the test under the APW bill of depressed counties, because if this bill is designed to meet the need of depressed counties, it seems to me it should be a rifle approach and be concentrated on counties that actually have some depression in them and have some excess unemployment in them. I offered an amendment in the subcommittee and in the full committee to limit the

application of this bill to those counties which met that test. That amendment was defeated both in the subcommittee and in the full committee, although by a narrow vote. However, in my opinion, this is the only proper amendment which will make this bill even barely palatable to those who feel there is some justification for a regional approach. I might say there is a serious doubt in my mind as to whether such a regional approach should be used. I think it is much fairer to use the approach that will be offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] in the form of a substitute which will make all counties in the United States which qualify under the ARA or the APW equally eligible for equivalent aid for the needs they must meet.

I might say that I cannot conceive of this House in good conscience allowing this bill to go through this House and forcing counties in other parts of the United States, which themselves are extremely depressed and have surplus unemployment, to pay additional taxes in order to pay for excess benefits for counties in another area although some of these counties have the highest per capita income in some of the States of our Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas. [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Committee this afternoon that the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] who just spoke is suggesting that APW and ARA should be put into this bill. I am wondering if this is what he really meant and whether or not if an APW bill came before the Congress or another ARA bill came before the Congress he would support it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman's question if my amendment is adopted which limits aid to the Appalachian region and only to those counties that meet the test of APW, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Will the gentleman vote for an APW bill as such?

Mr. BALDWIN. I have just answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Public Works last year and this year devoted a total of 32 separate sessions to the consideration, drafting, and perfecting of this bill that we have before us today. It has not been hastily devised nor quickly considered. It is, of course, one of the important legislative recommendations of our President. In the bill as it appears before us today are contained a number of amendments and suggestions which arose from the minority side during our consideration of this bill in the Public Works Committee last year. Contained also in the bill is a considerable amount of language suggested by the Governor

of Pennsylvania, Mr. Scranton. It is in that sense a bipartisan product of the efforts of the President, the Governors of the Appalachian region, the Members of the other body, and of the Public Works Committee of this House.

I think a reference to the map which was cited in the speech just concluded by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] will furnish any Member of this House quick and visible proof that this mountainous region known as Appalachia, stretching diagonally across the better part of 11 States, is unquestionably the largest and the longest lived depressed area anywhere in the United States. Family income within the Appalachian region lags fully 35 percent behind family income in the rest of the country. Unemployment in the Appalachian region is some 3 percentage points higher than it is for the rest of the country, and in certain sectors of the rural interior of Appalachia unemployment is reaching toward 10 percent.

Due to the rapid deterioration and decline of coal, timber, and marginal farm operations, the three pillars upon which the economy of this region was historically based, the people living in the Appalachian area have not shared in the prosperity and the progress which have been the lot of the rest of us in the 1960's.

Due to the rugged terrain and the inaccessibility of the vast rural interior of this region, industry has been discouraged from providing the wellsprings of development from which a new prosperity could flow.

Surely this generous and humanitarian nation of ours, which has given so unstintingly of our resources and of our substance to aid the underdeveloped areas overseas and throughout the world, will not now turn its back upon this vast underdeveloped area within our own borders. Charity, we are told, begins at home, though it need not necessarily end there. Yet certainly our primary responsibility is to those pockets of general need in our own country.

Much has been said today by the opponents of this measure to the effect that the bill provides a discriminatory favoritism for one region of the country. The implication is thus left that the bill is somehow unfair to the rest of the country. It must be admitted that it is a regional concept.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing new about that. From the very beginning of our Republic, it has been the policy of our Government to approach the problems of those less-favored, less-privileged regions of the Nation with strictly regional solutions. As early as 1785, just a very few years after the inception of the Republic, in the passage of the Northwest Land Ordinance, the citizens who lived along the relatively more prosperous and more developed eastern seaboard were asked to share of their bounty with those who lived north and west of the Ohio River.

Mr. Chairman, today there is not a single State in this Union which has not been to one extent or another the beneficiary of some essentially regional program of the Federal Government.

I would remind those of our colleagues who live in the 17 Western States that the reclamation program on which we have spent nearly \$5 billion is essentially a regional program. It applies only to those Western States, and they are the primary beneficiaries of its works.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. As the gentleman knows, under the reclamation program the users of the water have to pay back the amount of the investment over a 50-year period. If you offer such an amendment to this bill that the users of the area pay back the cost of the proposed program, it would be comparable to the reclamation program.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not want to get into a long colloquy concerning comparabilities with the reclamation program, except this: It is a regional program available to only a limited area of the country and financed by taxes from the entire Nation. Water users are privileged to repay Government loans over a 50-year amortization period with no interest charges. Surely this is a subsidy and a substantial benefit. That does not necessarily mean that it is bad.

Mr. Chairman, I support the reclamation program. I think it is a good program. I believe it has paid for itself. I believe all of these regional programs have paid for themselves. There are many, many regional programs which I could cite, and I say that these highways and roads in Appalachia are going to pay for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, about 84 percent of the moneys provided in this bill are devoted to highways. The way to assist an area which has a natural problem of mountainous terrain preventing the accessibility of commerce and industry to its interior is through highways, just as the way to assist an arid section which needs water resource development is in the development of its water resources. The West was retarded in its economic development through lack of usable water; Appalachia is retarded through lack of roads and communications. And so in this sense we seek to do through this bill much the same as reclamation has done for the West—to open it up for industry and commerce.

Our history is replete with regional programs.

The St. Lawrence Seaway was a regional program. The Cross-Florida Barge Canal was a regional program. The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway was a regional program. The money spent on the Mississippi River represented a regional program, as all water resource development programs have been regional or local programs in their initial application.

Mr. Chairman, when he was a young Congressman from Illinois in 1848, Abraham Lincoln pointed out on the floor of the House that because these so-called regional programs do contribute to the economic development of the various regions of our country, ultimately they can be demonstrably proven to serve the economic development of the Nation as a

whole. Mr. Lincoln pointed out that because of a canal in Illinois, the sugar merchant in New Orleans was able "to sell his sugar a little dearer" and the housewife in New York "to sugar her coffee a little cheaper."

I believe it is just as true today as it was then. Many programs are essentially regional programs; yet each of them has strengthened the Nation. The Tennessee Valley Authority is strictly a regional program. The Great Plains Conservation Act is purely regional in scope.

Members of Congress from Appalachia have voted for the crop support programs, notwithstanding the fact that 91 percent of the money provided in the tobacco subsidy goes to only six States, notwithstanding the fact that 70 percent of the money provided in the wheat subsidy program, for which this Congress in a recent 4-year period appropriated more than \$7 billion, has gone to nine States.

Mr. Chairman, were those Members of Congress from Appalachia to have taken a close-minded, narrow parochial attitude and said they were not going to vote for anything that does not directly benefit their own area, they would have voted against those programs.

I would remind my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. BALDWIN] who just preceded me that his State and mine, between them, consume something like almost one-half of the total Federal defense procurement dollars. In total dollar volume, of course, this means a great deal more than any of these other matters of which we have spoken. Yet, Members of Congress from the Appalachian region have voted for the Federal defense procurement program, notwithstanding that fact. And so, if we look at it from a long-range historical perspective, we come inescapably to the conclusion that this bill is not favoritism to this region.

Mr. Chairman, here is a region which contains 8½ percent of the population of the country, and it has received only 4.9 percent of the Federal tax expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I was pointing out that Appalachia contains 8½ percent of the population of the country. Yet it has received only 4.9 percent of the Federal tax revenues of the country.

So, when we look at it from that standpoint we cannot view this program as favoritism in the sense of some privilege they are entitled to, but rather as a redress of an historic imbalance or historic injustice.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma who has contributed so significantly to the committee consideration of this bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding because I wanted to compliment him not only upon the wonderful speech he is making which I think has caught the spirit of this program, but also upon the contribution he made

in the committee to the passage of this legislation, because I think the record will show that in most of the committee sessions which were held, and whenever the gentleman from Alabama was temporarily involved in legislative activity which prevented him from presiding, the gentleman from Texas took over the gavel and did a fine job of chairing the meetings of the committee, and advancing the bill to final consideration. With his discussion of the various regional bills and the action which the Government has taken in the past on the basic problems of a region, he has highlighted the essential equity of this program as well as it would be possible for anyone I know of to outline.

The gentleman from California, in raising the point that in reclamation programs the users of water paid back the full sum that the Government invested in the program, skips over the whole thrust of the reclamation program. The gentleman from California knows, as well as all Members who have served during the period we have had the reclamation law on the statute books, that the users of the water will pay back only the percentage which is allocated to the provision of irrigation water, and that the portion which has gone into the construction of these reservoirs for flood control purposes or for the purpose of hydroelectric power is not paid back by your irrigation users at all. As a matter of fact, these big dams which have made possible our reclamation program in the West and which most of the gentlemen enthusiastically supported have been in very large measure the largess of the rest of the country to make possible the development of very important water resources of the West. While your irrigator has undoubtedly helped to make possible the overall program, there is a very large part to which the taxpayers back in the Appalachian region have been contributing through the years.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman, both for his very considerate remarks and for his further clarification of the reclamation benefits.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would suggest to the gentleman from California that if he wants to get into a further discussion of reclamation he may wish to do it in his own time, since I have only a short while remaining.

I have one other illustration which goes to the whole concept of whether this is favoritism or not:

Last year this Congress passed a bill for the express purpose of assisting our fellow citizens in the State of Alaska to rehabilitate themselves from the ravages of a sudden natural disaster. Here we are asking that we assist the citizens of the Appalachian region to rehabilitate themselves from the ravages of a chronic, historic disaster. The conditions are in many ways the same. This is not a handout, this is not leaf-raking or make-work or anything of that sort. It does not aim at providing a job on the Federal payroll for the people of Appalachia. On the contrary, it is long range in its outlook and in its benefits. It attempts to

provide only the basic infrastructure necessary to create a climate and an atmosphere conducive to economic growth. It relies upon the private sector with only sufficient stimulation to generate economic growth which alone can provide the dynamics that will bring this region into the full-fledged technologies of the 20th century.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECREST. I might point out that in the area I represent several hundred million dollars of coal has been mined. The owners of these mines lived in Cleveland and other cities. The profits all went out. Our wealth has been used to enrich the rest of the United States. We are only asking that you help us to build back the area that has now been depleted of its natural resources, a thing upon which we had to depend entirely.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his timely contribution. I will now be glad to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

The gentleman from Oklahoma made a point about the reclamation projects, in which he stated that part of the money must be repaid. Then he said that any additional benefits, for instance, the whole question of flood control, was not repaid. Of course this is true. But may I say while it is true on a countrywide basis, and all of the dams of the Tennessee Valley Authority have taken advantage of the flood control provision of our laws so that they may be built to preserve flood control protection and to prevent flooding below. The reclamation dams have taken advantage of that provision, just as all other areas of the country have done.

Mr. WRIGHT. I quite agree with the gentleman from California, just as I also agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma. I think the entire Nation benefits when any area is strengthened. But the point I was attempting to make is that the reclamation program is confined to 17 Western States and therefore is a regional program. I was not assailing the program. I think it has had great benefits for the Nation, just as other projects have had. The development of forest roads and trails, similarly, have benefited the entire country. Yet each of these programs is essentially a regional program, and there is no getting around it. Even crop support programs are regional, because they apply and limit their application to those areas which have an established history of growing certain crops, but they benefit the entire Nation, just as this will benefit the entire Nation.

We are not attempting to give Appalachia a handout but rather to give them a hand up. We are not attempting to assault just the symptoms of the disease but rather to go to the roots of the disease itself and let them rehabilitate their

own economy. The people of Appalachia are ready to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, but they just do not have the bootstraps. The purpose of this bill is to provide for them the bootstraps—the roads and hospitals and vocational schools—which have been so helpful to the rest of the Nation in enjoying the prosperity of the 20th century.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Texas. He became very persuasive in his remarks trying to convince this committee that this legislation is not unduly and unfairly helping a certain region. I became even more convinced of the fact that it must be as I heard him invoke the history of our country and the broad sweep of his knowledge of the history of our country. Indeed his remarks were persuasive. But nobody can deny that this legislation is highly discriminatory, highly unfair. Hear again the testimony of the person who it is understood will operate this act as the single Federal Commissioner:

On page 42 of the hearings Mr. SWEENEY stated:

I think we ought to speak frankly. The name of the Appalachian game is preferential treatment.

The programs that the gentleman from Texas thought up to implore the House to think big are not in point. He spoke of the tobacco program, but every place that grows tobacco participates in the benefits of that program.

Consider the wheat program. Every place that grows wheat gets the benefits of the wheat program.

But not so the Appalachia program. You have rural poverty and disadvantaged pockets that have not shared in the national progress of the last 50 years, but they are not confined to Appalachia as defined in this bill.

As I pointed out in my own additional views in the report on this bill, when I heard witnesses speak about the plight of some of these sections of Appalachia, I could have been right back in parts of New Hampshire. The Appalachian Mountains are in New Hampshire—the valleys are just as deep and the hills, in fact, are a lot more beautiful and a lot higher. We have problems with timber development; problems with access roads and the cost of constructing them; problems in financing local sewage-treatment works; problems in financing health facilities; and problems involving proper use of water resources. We have unemployment problems which require vocational educational institutions for solution.

We have problems of out-migration, and we have the problems of distances from commercial industrial markets.

That part of Appalachia was left out unfairly is a matter of record. In the Senate the unfairness became so aggravated that the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], succeeded in adding 13 counties to Appalachia. He succeeded. But we now find that the 13 counties that he added were relatively prosperous

counties. As a result, there will be an amendment before this committee to add counties in New York that are really part of Appalachia and are really in need of this treatment.

These are but surface indicia that show how completely unfair and narrow and discriminatory this legislation is.

The gentleman from Texas has missed this point or rather the point has hit home and he is desperately trying to avoid it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] kept speaking of the mountainous region as a requisite for this program. Am I seeing things on that map? Am I seeing the application of this program to the Rio Grande down in Texas—that low land down there?

Mr. CLEVELAND. No, I think this map that was offered in evidence by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] shows the depressed areas as defined by the ARA and the Accelerated Public Works Act throughout the entire country.

Mr. GROSS. It has nothing whatever to do with Texas; is that right?

Mr. CLEVELAND. No, this map shows all the areas that are considered areas of high unemployment and as being depressed areas under the definition by the ARA and the APWP.

Mr. GROSS. This proposed program does not pertain to any part of Texas?

Mr. CLEVELAND. It pertains only to the Appalachian area which I am indicating with my hand—parts of Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and all of West Virginia. The gentleman would be interested to know that one of the parts of Alabama is the Huntsville area where they had more than a billion dollars of Government contracts a year ago. It also includes the Spartanburg area of South Carolina and the wealthiest county of South Carolina. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa will also be interested to know that it includes the impoverished little town of Pittsburgh and its Golden Triangle that the industrial revolution has apparently passed by. And we could go on and on. Indeed, there are 76 counties in the Appalachia region, the gentleman from Iowa I am sure would be interested to know, that are wealthy counties and do not even qualify under the ARA or the accelerated public works program.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I would not want to hear that Texas is involved in this because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] just said that California and Texas are splitting up 50 percent of the defense procurement contracts. I would not think that Texas would have the nerve to come in on any part of the Appalachia program or any other poverty program.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman. I hope the gentleman recalls that Texas also benefits from the beef import quotas which raise prices of meat in New England to consumers, from the

residual oil quotas which raise the price of fuel in New England, and from the depletion allowance which permit large oil companies to pay practically no income taxes, not even to help Appalachia. But, as I have said, this is a day when you have to be big and think big to do business with big government.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I hate to disabuse the mind of my distinguished colleague from Iowa. Largely, the eastern tier of counties in Texas, which are the ARA and APW counties, will soon, I am sure, be joining the counties in Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and a few other States, in what has already been described and apparently been committed as the next region to come before this body for money and programs, the Ozark region.

As a matter of fact, it was interesting to note the article in the Sunday Star for February 28, 1965. They have "cranked up" so far that the AFL-CIO is already talking about it. This is going to be the new demand.

This is what the article says:

The AFL-CIO executive council warned yesterday that the Nation's booming economy threatens to lose its steam this year unless Congress acts swiftly.

As an aside, we have already provided for spending about \$11 billion acting swiftly in the past 6 years.

The council also recommended a series of special programs to develop depressed areas such as—

I might add, not exclusive of—

the Appalachia States, the Upper Great Lakes areas and Ozarks. Only the Appalachian program is currently underway.

It has been estimated, in the testimony before the committee, by a witness—Mr. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., who is staff engineer and staff counsel for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which testimony appears on page 217 of the hearings—that there would be between \$5 and \$10 billion cost for these regional programs. The cost of Appalachia alone has been estimated by witnesses to be about \$4 billion.

I believe it should be understood that this is only the beginning of a series. The gentleman from Iowa should fully recognize that. This is the beginning of a series of regional approaches, segmenting the United States, dividing America into regions, setting up supergovernments, giving the Federal representative veto power over any and all programs and projects. The final cost of these programs, it is estimated in the testimony, could be as high as \$10 billion. Is that not correct?

Mr. CLEVELAND. There is testimony in the record to support the gentleman's statement.

Mr. CRAMER. I should like to ask the gentleman a further question, with respect to the discrimination. I believe this might be a good place to set the argument at rest at this time.

The argument is made, with respect to discrimination, that other communities

will indirectly benefit. The direct benefit will be to Appalachia, and there will be indirect benefits elsewhere, it is said.

Why not give a direct benefit to the rest of the Nation, where the communities, as are evidenced on the map in green and gold, have an equal need?

Mr. CLEVELAND. The answer to the question is, That if we are to have a truly fair national program all areas which suffer similar economic blight and disadvantage, such as suffered in parts of the Appalachian area, should share equally and fairly our national wealth to remedy the situation.

This is my understanding of what the gentleman's bill and the bill introduced by myself and other Members on our side, the Resources Development Act of 1965, will do. This is one reason why I support it, and for other reasons set forth in the record in our report on that legislation.

Mr. CRAMER. A second point has been made in answer to the charge of discrimination, which is obvious and cannot be refuted. The map speaks for itself.

The argument is made, "Well, there are other programs actually carried out in certain areas." They talk about the cross-Florida barge canal, the intercoastal waterway, the Mississippi River, and what have you. The fallacy of that reasoning is that those types of programs are available to any place in America where the economic justification can be established, and every State in America has the right to qualify if those standards are met.

Is that not correct?

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is true, and this type of legislation is handled by our Public Works Committee. This is why I feel that the gentleman from Texas was grievously wrong in using those as examples of regional preference. They are not examples of regional preference.

They are examples of the application of national legislation in particular places and to particular situations in the country, but which are equally available to every area of the country that can meet the standards established by the programs.

Mr. CRAMER. I ask the gentleman from New Hampshire further, is not one of the clearest examples, of the fact that our committee has not in the past dealt on a discriminatory regional basis with programs of this sort, the highway program, which comprises about 77 percent of this bill? We have at no time passed legislation involving a highway system which related solely to one region of America as against all of the rest of the country, when the rest of the Nation helps to pay the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is correct, and it probably is one of the most important things in highlighting the unfairness and discrimination involved in this bill. This violates the entire concept of our national highway program. I am sure when the full impact of it dawns on our country and the people of the country, the repercussions will be extremely serious.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

I would like to ask the gentleman an additional question. I ask the gentleman, is not the fact that it frankly discriminates against the rest of the Nation one of the principal reasons why in our opinion no witnesses outside of the Appalachian region were called in so as to determine what their attitude would be as it relates to this type of legislation, particularly with reference to highways.

Mr. CLEVELAND. We heard no witnesses from outside Appalachia other than certain people from downtown, as you could expect, who testified in favor of this bill.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Just for a question.

Mr. DENT. I noted in your remarks you made reference to the city of Pittsburgh. It appeared to me—and correct me if I am wrong—that it was your opinion the city of Pittsburgh was not in need of the benefits which might accrue from the passage of this legislation.

Mr. CLEVELAND. My statement was that I have read about the city of Pittsburgh, although I have not had the pleasure of visiting the city of Pittsburgh recently; I know about the Golden Triangle and the Mellon Institute and your other fine institutes of higher learning. When I heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], speak practically with tears in his eyes about how this bill will help areas that have been bypassed for the last 100 years by our industrial progress, I could not believe that Pittsburgh was among them. I do not think many people have thought that a place like Pittsburgh would be in this bill. That was my comment.

Mr. DENT. Might I say, coming from near that city, I have never been blinded by the glitter from the Golden Triangle, because it quit glittering years ago due to the pernicious unemployment existing in this area. Pittsburgh, Pa., at one time, up until very recently, had an unemployment ratio of 14.7 percent. We have the Mellon Institute, yes. We have the Golden Triangle of fable but not actuality. I guarantee you that it is nothing more than the mortar, mud, and bricks that make up the communities and the streets of every other community. We, in that area, believe it is time some of the assistance we have given so willingly over the years to regions all over the United States who needed it be returned to us.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, in my additional views I make a couple of points which I would like to repeat for the benefit of the committee. My essential complaint about this bill is the fact that it is unfair not only to many communities in my district but certainly to many communities and districts outside the Appalachian area. I wish to address this part of my remarks to what I call the industrial and job piracy inherent in

this bill. All of us will agree, I think, that new industry and the development of new roads into an area is an important key to the economic improvement and development of an area. It is also true that many communities throughout the country are in direct competition for expanding industry and new industries that they hope to bring into their communities. What the Appalachia bill does, in the words of Government witnesses, is make these centers of prosperity not small towns in Appalachia, but centers of prosperity where there is a significant chance or potential for growth, as they term it, in the words of the bill—and the bill is confined to places that have such a significant potential. Its purpose is to strengthen these centers and make them almost unbearably attractive to new industry by building hospitals, schools, vocational training centers, libraries, sewage plants, and access roads and private roads running indeed right up to the door of a new industry or into a timber preserve or recreational area. It builds all of these facilities with up to 80 percent in Federal dollars. It hopes to make them so attractive that any new industry or any old industry that had expansion in mind would have to go to Appalachia. This is where the essential unfairness becomes clear, because there are many other areas, if we look at Mr. BALDWIN's map—and all of you must know of some of these in your own districts—which have the same acute need for help in bringing new industries and to help with the taxload that you have in those areas and to improve the economic climate. When the Federal Government gets into the act and makes it so attractive for the new industry to go into one small part of the country, then you have the Federal Government acting in direct competition with almost every industrial planning agency and almost every economic planning agency and every chamber of commerce and every city and town and community in America. This is what highlights the unfairness of this bill. This is industrial and job piracy.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished lady from Illinois [Mrs. REID].

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the legislation we are considering today is extremely complex. It would perhaps appear on the surface that the main issue to be decided is the desirability of improving the economic status of the people of the 11 States of the Appalachia area, and certainly the economic welfare of all our citizens should be of utmost concern to us in the Congress. But there are other compelling issues in this bill which we, as Representatives of our respective congressional districts, must also ponder; and the welfare objectives of S. 3 should not cause us to lose sight of the dominant questions involving basic changes in the direction of our public policy.

Few among us will argue the merits of improving the economic status of those who reside in areas which unfortunately have not been able to share in the normal prosperity of the times. An adequate

and comfortable standard of living for all Americans should be the ultimate goal of our domestic economic policy, and we all hope for the day when this can become a reality. But the attainment of this goal also involves the question as to the proper method of approach. Here today we are considering the establishment of a rather far-reaching precedent in our public policy, one which will authorize preferential treatment for one geographical region of America to the disadvantage of similar regions which are equally depressed in economic progress. Here, also, we are considering the proper limitations which should be placed on Federal grants-in-aid. Here, too, we are considering matters of economic justification, the feasibility of preferential highway development over and above our existing national Federal-aid highway programs, the inconsistency of the proposed land improvement program with our national agricultural policies, and the wisdom of authorizing 100 percent federally financed medical facilities.

Since S. 3 does involve basic issues of public policy, we should, therefore, give thoughtful consideration not only to the question of further extending the concept of Federal grants-in-aid, but also to the principle of providing special Federal assistance to a specific geographical area through such a new, broad, and costly program. It is difficult to see how we can in good conscience justify such a program, financed by all taxpayers of the Nation, for the benefit of the people of one particular region. It is also difficult to see why it is necessary to launch a new program of this magnitude which will overlap and duplicate existing authority which the Congress has previously provided for the same types of aid envisioned by the Appalachia bill. For example, we already have the Economic Opportunity Act, the Area Redevelopment Act, the Federal-Aid Highway Act, the Hill-Burton Act, the Vocational Education Act, and others which were originally designed to accomplish the same objectives sought by S. 3 and, at the same time, extend equal benefits to the entire Nation. This new program, if adopted, will without doubt bring forth similar requests from other regions of the United States where economic development is also substandard, and one can foresee serious future problems of Federal fiscal policy. This bill will, in my judgment, establish a disturbing precedent for increasing Federal grants-in-aid on a nationwide basis to the 70 and 80 percent formula which would be approved for Appalachia.

Another inequity in this legislation is the omission of proper standards for the determination of eligible areas for Federal grants, other than for highway construction. Clearly there is no justification for assistance to all of the 360 counties of Appalachia, for at least 76 counties included in this bill are now ineligible as depressed areas for financial assistance under current Government standards. Furthermore, the Appalachia program is to be a 6-year project, and no provision has been made for the exemption of eligible counties when their eco-

nomic progress attains a certain level or, conversely, to later include currently eligible areas which may become substandard in the future. Also, it is interesting to note that according to 1960 census figures, which although outdated have been used in connection with the justification of this program, 229 of the 360 counties in Appalachia showed a median family income in excess of \$3,000—above the administration's poverty definition. Standards of need, therefore, rather than geographical location, should be the determining factor in this type of legislation.

With reference to the highway provisions of the bill, it is obvious that the 70-percent highway grants represent special treatment for a particular area and are thus discriminatory nationwide. In some of the States in question, this program could result in minimization of highway construction under the regular 50-50 matching funds program in favor of the 70-percent aid program for Appalachia. All States in the area would also have the benefits of three highway programs—the Interstate System, the regular highway aid programs, and the Appalachia program. To my knowledge, no study has been made as to the ratio of capital cost of these highways to the long-range economic benefits to be derived from them, again leaving us in doubt as to the economic justification.

Another conflict in Federal policy appears in the land improvement provisions of this bill. The 80-percent grants which would be made available for soil and water conservation practices could in effect result in increased cropland and pastureland production, thereby promoting uneconomic farm units at a time when there is already overproduction and the Department of Agriculture is paying farmers to take land out of production.

Still another new precedent which would be established by this legislation is 100-percent Federal financing of operating costs of hospitals and other local health facilities. This is a principle which the Congress has consistently rejected in the past and, if considered by the appropriate committee and presented separately, would most likely be rejected again. The question which comes to my mind is—does such a policy not constitute another giant stride toward socialized medicine? In addition, does the fact that the Federal Government would provide 100-percent financing not mean that the States will abdicate their rights of control over these facilities? After all, our past experience in Federal-aid programs has clearly shown that such assistance also brings Federal control.

Section 214 of this bill also involves questionable legislative procedure since it is a tacit "back door" approach to the continuation and expansion of the Public Works Acceleration Act and the Area Redevelopment Act.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I have listened carefully to the testimony on this legislation and have also devoted a great deal of study to the supporting data made available to

us. Although the initial cost of the Appalachia program is \$1.1 billion, it is logical to assume that the total cost over the 6-year period will perhaps approximate \$4 billion. The administration of a program of such magnitude is bound to result in further intrusion of Federal regulation and control in the affairs of the participating States, and the precedents embodied in this bill represent a drastic departure from our traditional view of the Federal-State relationship as far as assistance and grants-in-aid are concerned.

I feel, therefore, that this omnibus-type bill under consideration does represent unjustified preferential treatment for one region to the disadvantage of other areas perhaps equally as deserving and, furthermore, that it offers no assurance that the desired economic objectives can or will be achieved. As legislators, we must also consider the many ramifications of the precedents which would be established in this particular approach and the new Federal-aid policies to which we would be committed. For these many reasons, I do not expect to give this bill my support.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. REID of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois for her very learned discussion of this legislation. She has certainly been a loyal and hard-working member of our committee. I want to congratulate her on her very constructive and helpful remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of this \$1 billion Appalachian development bill which is under consideration of the House today, assistance would be limited to areas in 11 States, or possibly in 1 more, if New York State is included. In these 11 preferentially treated States, there would be some 360 counties, as I understand, which would be qualified for assistance, and of these 360 counties, 76 are not even economically depressed, in accordance with the definition established for distressed areas under the Area Redevelopment Act. I do not think this is right.

Meanwhile, as an example, in the State of Washington, there are 15 out of our 39 counties that have areas which are depressed to the extent that they do qualify under the Area Redevelopment Act.

The question is, Can I, in all good conscience, representing the State of Washington, vote for a measure which would tax citizens in these 15 depressed areas in my State to assist the people that reside in 76 counties in 11 other States which do not have similar depressed conditions?

However, even more disturbing to me is a statement made during debate on

this bill in the other body by the majority leader. It lends substance to the frequently heard charge made in connection with passage in the Senate of the Appalachian bill, that it was motivated as an unprecedented opportunity for political logrolling. I have heard it said that the bill passed as a result of promises for similar legislation to aid other areas of the country, outside of the 11 States covered by this bill. The majority leader of the other body, in fact, openly stated that the administration was working on similar other regional programs.

In this regard, a letter from the Budget Bureau was read into the Record during the Senate debate, stating that the administration proposes, very shortly, through an extension of the area redevelopment program, to initiate measures to assist additional regional planning. So it seems clear, Mr. Chairman, that someone is looking toward the next election—just as has been the case with this present bill. This legislation appears to me to be a Pandora's box.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the Federal Government assisting in the economic upbuilding of depressed areas where there is a reasonable chance of accomplishing the objective, and providing, further, that there is no discrimination to one region in favor of another, and providing that prosperous areas will not be receiving assistance at the expense of people of less prosperous areas. But this bill obviously does not conform to that criteria.

Likewise, Mr. Chairman, I have other objections and these are to the way S. 3 would operate in respect to State and local authorities so that in carrying out this law, they would be subject to dictation. As the additional views of the minority point out in the report on S. 3, this bill would create a new regional government with absolute veto authority and thereby establish dictatorial powers in the person of a single Federal representative on the Appalachian Regional Commission.

In short, I oppose S. 3, and instead, intend to vote for a substitute proposal which I understand will be offered. This alternate proposal would extend Federal financial assistance to all areas throughout the United States which qualify as areas of substantial unemployment, under the definition of existing law. The plan under this alternative proposal would utilize existing Government agencies and authorize State and local officials to initiate projects, and would require States to provide matching funds.

Under this latter arrangement, there would be no discrimination as between regions of the United States, and the local authorities would have a say as to their programs. In any event, I hope S. 3 is rejected. It is poor legislation and should be defeated.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of the administration's Appalachia program, bill S. 3.

Most particularly, I wish to speak in support of section 211 thereof, that section which deals with aid for vocational education in Appalachia.

A quick glance at the statistics shows immediately that the Appalachian area has fallen far behind the rest of the country in education and training. Apparently the work being done in the academic area is not truly serving the needs of the young people of Appalachia. We find that 12 percent of these youngsters have not finished the fifth grade and that an astounding 68 percent—over two-thirds—have not finished high school. This should make it apparent indeed that if these young people are to grow up to be productive citizens, we need an increase in vocational training.

At the present time the Appalachia region receives Federal aid in the amount of \$24 million a year. It has been estimated that \$105 million is needed to enable this region to catch up with the rest of the country. The additional appropriation in bill S. 3 calls for an additional \$8 million a year for 2 years. Certainly an annual appropriation totaling \$32 million cannot be called extravagant if we are to make even a gesture toward the improvement of this serious problem. We must assure the young people of Appalachia that they will have a chance to become productive, self-sustaining citizens. We have the obligation to give them the tools, the skills, to enter into and compete in the labor market of future years.

Mr. Chairman, the children in Appalachia must look to us here in the Congress for their hopes for the future. They have no power to publicly persuade in behalf of any legislation. They cannot attend hearings; they cannot give testimony; they have no lobby. As our late President said, all of us as American citizens have a responsibility to future generations. We have the responsibility to hand over to those who follow us a nation that is prosperous. This we have often done but sometimes we have not. We have a responsibility to hand over to them a nation at peace. This we have often done but there have been times that we have not. We have a responsibility most of all to see that they enter adulthood in this Nation prepared to meet the contemporary demands that they will face intellectually, socially, and with proper training.

Mr. Chairman, in relation to this bill we have heard terms such as fraud and hoax. Without a doubt the greatest fraud, the most cruel hoax on these young people would be to thrust them into a world that is beyond their capabilities. History will judge us in future years as to how we meet this responsibility and these young people will judge us also. Let us not fail either.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McEWEN].

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I share the concern that has been expressed by some of my colleagues here today over the fact that this bill, alleged to treat with poverty as it is, treats with it on a regional basis rather than national.

I hope the Members will permit my remarks to be, if you will, of a parochial or provincial nature, as I feel obliged to speak in relation to my own congressional district, which could be said to embrace northern Appalachia.

The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND], said that Appalachia reaches into the White Mountain region of New Hampshire. In my own congressional district, the 31st District of New York, we have counties that embrace the northern Adirondack Mountains. I should like to refer to this area in particular.

But a reference was just made by the gentleman from New Jersey to the educational disadvantage of the Appalachian region. The figures that I have on that, Mr. Chairman, from the Legislative Reference Service, indicate that the Appalachian region, as originally defined by the President's Appalachian Region Commission, had 32.3 percent of its people who have completed a high school education. I am advised that with the inclusion of more prosperous and progressive areas within Appalachia, that figure of 32.3 percent would now be somewhat higher.

In my own congressional district, 36.7 percent of our population have completed high school. In one county in particular, 32.5 percent, or merely two-tenths of a percent greater than that of Appalachia.

We have heard about unemployment in the Appalachian region, as if it were unique to this area alone. The Appalachian area as originally defined had an unemployment rate of 7.1 percent. In one county in the 31st Congressional District of New York, in the northern part of Appalachia, in the Adirondack Mountains, in the same period of time that Appalachia as a whole had 7.1 percent unemployment this county had 14.6 percent of unemployment.

For this, and other reasons, I find it impossible on the floor of this House to vote, as I found it impossible in committee as a result of the rejection of numerous amendments, to support this bill in its present form.

Here we are asking that people, such as in this one county that I cited, in my district, having twice the rate of unemployment that Appalachia has, support a program for a region that now embraces some of the most prosperous communities in America.

Reference has been made to Huntsville, Ala.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Spartanburg, S.C. I fail to appreciate why this regional approach should be taken.

I was interested in noting the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], in his very persuasive argument for this regional concept, citing other regional legislation that this Congress has enacted in prior years. Among others, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] mentioned the St. Lawrence Seaway with which I have a degree of familiarity since it lies within my congressional district. But here as has been pointed out, there was a demonstrated need for the seaway and it was shown how this waterway, this great public

works undertaking, was going to serve the national interest. There was a demonstration of its economic justification. So I am sure was the case with the Intra-coastal Waterway and with other regional plans and undertakings.

But in this instance, Mr. Chairman, I fail to appreciate why America should be taxed as a whole to take an approach at one limited segment of the problem of lack of economic growth and job opportunities.

I note that there was offered and accepted in the other body an amendment to this bill to permit, "on an appropriate basis," inclusion of some 13 New York counties in the Appalachian region. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that of these 13 counties along or near the Pennsylvania border, only 1 of them is indicated as being eligible either under the ARA or APWP standards. The other 12 counties are not.

The amendment I offered in committee to the Senate bill would have changed this New York inclusion from these relatively prosperous southern tier counties to include Catskill and Adirondack counties—9 of the 11 being ARA or APWP eligible. It would have embraced 9 of the 13 such counties in the State of New York.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the bill in its present form is one that I cannot support and I fail to appreciate how anyone having a congressional district similar to mine, with substantial unemployment and a need for job opportunities, could support this limited regional approach to what has proved to be a national problem.

Also I have concern, Mr. Chairman, as to a number of other aspects of this bill, particularly that relating to access highways.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman gets to that subject, will he yield for a question relating to the Kennedy of New York amendment?

Mr. McEWEN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. On page 44, line 19, it is indicated that the Commission is authorized and directed to invite the State of New York to participate in the Commission—and I quote "on an appropriate basis."

Now in our discussion on this amendment and in the hearings on it, as I recall, the Governor of the State of West Virginia indicated very clearly that he was not going to slice this pie up with New York and he was not going to vote to provide highway moneys as a member of the Commission, to put highway moneys into New York or other grant programs into New York. He said, to paraphrase what he said, because I do not recall exactly, that he would be willing to vote that certain studies take place in New York.

The gentleman, of course, heard that testimony and is familiar with that testimony.

Mr. McEWEN. Yes; I am.

Mr. CRAMER. Does this not end up making out of these 13 counties step-

children as compared to the rest of the region?

Mr. McEWEN. I believe that "step-children," in answer to the gentleman, is a very apt description. They are certainly not to come in on the same basis as counties in the other 11 States, whatever the phrase "on an appropriate basis" might mean.

Since the gentleman referred to what the distinguished Governor said before the ad hoc committee, I believe the gentleman might anticipate that "an appropriate basis" would be something less than provided for the other States.

Mr. CRAMER. I also recall that the gentleman from New York took part in the discussions with respect to the meaning of the language. The gentleman from New York was asked by the gentleman from Florida the meaning of the language on page 44, lines 10, 11, and 12.

What counties are to be included? It is true, is it not, that the counties are not set out by name as they are in the rest of the bill?

As it relates to New York.

Mr. McEWEN. That is true. My identification of the 13 counties comes from reading the proceedings of the other body.

Mr. CRAMER. The only record of the counties intended to be included by the author of the amendment, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], was the reference to the counties he stated in the RECORD, the 13 listed, which are defined as follows:

The inclusion of such counties of the State of New York as are contiguous to the Appalachian region as defined in this section and counties contiguous thereto.

I have heard it suggested by some that this means one could go right on up with "contiguous to," "contiguous to," "contiguous to," and there is no limitation to any 13 counties in the wording of the amendment.

Does the gentleman understand that there is no limitation of 13 counties in the amendment?

Mr. McEWEN. To answer the gentleman's question, I believe that is true. There is no limitation.

Mr. CRAMER. This is the only section in which the counties are not listed. There is not even a number specified as to how many in that State are to be included. It is quite clear that whatever counties are included will probably be brought in under a decision to be made by the Commission members, and not by the Congress, as to exactly the basis on which they want to bring the counties in; is that not correct?

Mr. McEWEN. That is correct. As a matter of fact, pages 41 through 44 of the bill in detail set forth the counties in all the other States, except for the State of West Virginia which is included in its entirety. There is a detailed recitation of exactly which counties in the other States are to be included.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment offered in the committee would have brought into

the Appalachian region the counties which are really depressed counties in his State, or a large percentage of them, which are those in the mountainous region; is that correct?

Mr. McEWEN. That is correct. It would have brought in 9 of the 13 counties in the State of New York which have been ARA eligible. It would have included 9 of the 13 in the State, and 9 of the 11 counties in this inclusion would be ARA eligible.

Mr. CRAMER. It is almost inconceivable to me that our committee would take an attitude, "you can't cross a 't' or dot an 'i' in this bill."

I believe this is perhaps one of the clearest examples of that, in that the gentleman offered a perfectly logical amendment. The gentleman is a member of the committee and his amendment was voted down summarily.

I likewise point out that a gentleman now on the floor, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] properly made a request that one county which is surrounded by other counties which are depressed be included. Those other counties are in the legislation. The county which the gentleman from Alabama wished to add was Lamar County, which is surrounded by other depressed counties but was left out of the bill.

The committee did not even see fit to make that amendment, which was so obviously meritorious. The only conclusion to which I can come—and I ask the gentleman if he agrees with me—is that the orders had come down that they were not to cross a "t" or dot an "i" and this bill had to be ramrodded through the committee in exactly the form it came from the Senate, even though in the form it came from the Senate there were many shortcomings, as illustrated by the one New York amendment alone. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. McEWEN. I would have to agree with the gentleman from Florida on that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. My distinguished colleague from New York alluded to the committee amendment. If he will look at the record and read it closely, I think the name of that amendment, as he will see, should be the Kennedy-Javits amendment, because, as you will see, the distinguished senior Senator from New York concurred in the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New York, and modified it and proposed some changes which were accepted by the junior Senator. Then, of course, it was passed by the other body. This is just a point of clarification to show that it was really a bipartisan amendment.

Mr. McEWEN. I believe the gentleman is correct in that the senior Senator did have something to do with naming some counties in this area. He was trying to assist the junior Senator from New York in identifying this particular area, I think.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to get the gentleman from New York off his subject of access roads in asking my questions. I will be glad to yield the gentleman additional time, if need be, to discuss that subject.

Mr. McEWEN. Thank you, Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. Chairman, on access roads, it does seem to me this is one of a number of features of this bill which appears to be rather unique. There is nothing in here specifying standards for these roads. There is no assurance from this bill that these roads will serve primarily, if at all, a public use. It has been brought out in discussions in committee—and I assume it will be brought out here on the floor, also—that the admitted purpose of these access roads is to help in the attraction and the location of industries and resorts. It does seem peculiar to me that we should be asked to enact for this one region the construction of highways to serve for private purposes and private profit for the use of those using a particular industry or resort rather than highways which will serve the general traveling public and the economy and the commerce of the Nation.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this additional time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to the committee that the gentleman from North Carolina who will address the committee has done considerable work on this proposal. He has been before the committee this year and last year rendering valuable assistance and has been most helpful in the considerations and deliberations of the committee. It is always good to have you working with the committee, Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill because it offers hope and economic uplift to a large section of our Nation. This is, in my opinion, the most important single piece of legislation for the people whom I represent that has been considered since I became a Member of Congress.

This is a program to rebuild and revitalize the economy of the entire Appalachian area. The highway building proposals in the Appalachian bill, coupled with its other features, promises relief to an area which has suffered economically because of an inadequate highway system.

The Appalachian area was settled in the early days by pioneers, who were adventurous and not content to sit still but wanted to advance and explore and seek new opportunities. They moved to a rugged mountain area which offered a challenge and a promise; and for a while, that promise was realized.

But as the years moved on, in many cases, timber and mineral resources were depleted. During recent years, the people in this area have been caught in the backlash of an industrial revolution. The revolution in American agriculture which took the mules from the farm and replaced them with expensive machinery destroyed small mountain farms or made them uneconomical. The 14 western North Carolina counties which I am privileged to represent in Congress lost 14,000 farm jobs between 1947 and 1957. In counties where additional jobs in industry have not been created, there has been much unemployment, underemployment, and outmigration.

In most sections of the Appalachian mountains, as in my area, the people have been active in trying to solve their own problems. Since 1948, Western North Carolina Associated Communities has been an active organization promoting regional development. This organization founded the Western North Carolina Regional Planning Commission which, with the aid of a professional planning agency, made an economic analysis of the area and outlined a development program. The development report stated that the key to the development of western North Carolina is roads and highways, and I know that the same applies to other sections of Appalachia.

The Appalachian bill is a historic landmark in Federal-State relationships. It embodies a unique State-Federal partnership approach. It places a tremendous responsibility on each State in developing the type of program that will work in that State and in helping provide the necessary matching funds. It preserves the rights of States by providing that a State must give its consent before any program is carried out within its boundaries. It represents a practical effort to put natural resources to work by means of roads, hospitals, soil conservation, and education. It helps the people in an area to help themselves.

This is primarily a roadbuilding bill with nearly 80 cents of each dollar going for highways.

Civilization moves with transportation and transportation has been an important factor in the development of each section of our great country. The Appalachian region lies close to great concentrations of people and wealth. But isolation caused by inadequate highways and transportation facilities has prevented the extension of such growth and economic prosperity into the Appalachian mountains. The establishment in this region of an adequate system of highways is the key to its development. Highways are needed to ease traffic congestion in some places and are needed as an instrument of economic development throughout the Appalachian area.

By opening the door to transportation, we lay the foundation for private enterprise to come in to build and develop wealth and jobs. The area is rich in climate, in water, and timber resources, and in human resources. Make

the area accessible with modern highways and these resources will bring about its development along industrial and recreational lines and will convert it into a land of promise.

The various sections of our great country have individual needs and problems. In some cases, the economic need is harbor development; in other cases, dredging of rivers for commerce or other construction is needed. Out West, the need is development of water resources, and as a member of the House Interior Committee I have supported programs to meet these great public needs.

My colleague and friend, the gentleman from California, said that this bill is favoritism to the Appalachian area. In response I would say that if and after we pass this bill during the next 5 years, while it is in effect, more Federal money will still be spent in California than in the entire Appalachian area. I am proud of this prosperity that we have in California. I say we, because the prosperity of California benefits the entire country. Likewise the poverty of the Appalachian area hurts the entire country and hurts California, and Florida, and New York, and the other States. In geometry we learned the whole equals to the sum of its parts. As we strengthen any part of this country, we strengthen the entire country. This is a regional program which over a period of years will pay for itself.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I come to the members of the Committee today as a Member of Congress from the Appalachian region. I know that region well, specifically in my own area of the country.

Mr. Chairman, there does exist some poverty. There does exist some need.

Very frankly, Mr. Chairman, I explored, in my own conscience, the possibility of casting a vote in the affirmative on this bill. But I cannot do so in good conscience because there are other demands upon my conscience that call to a greater and higher purpose.

Mr. Chairman, as I sat in my seat this afternoon I looked at the young people today going in and out of the galleries. I am trying to let my mind project to a greater problem in our Nation, that of bringing into economic balance our income as compared to our outgo.

We have watched in the past several decades the devaluation of our dollar. We are concerned now today, paramount among all issues, outside of the peace of our country, with our economic stability.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for a piece of legislation that weakens the economic stability of our country. I cannot vote for a piece of legislation today which has for its purpose the building of roads today and then send the bill to our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the major portion of this bill, if enacted, would be devoted to road construction. I say to the gentlemen from the Appalachian area and of my own great State of Ala-

bama that we have done a good job in building roads. We have probed into many of these areas with good roads. We have taken upon ourselves the necessity to tax in the various States such items as gasoline that have brought into our States enough money to do a good job with a roadbuilding program. I say to the States that if this is not adequate, then look into your own State building program. The building of roads in these areas is not primarily that of a Federal function.

Mr. Chairman, already we have working a good combination of Federal and State cooperation in roadbuilding programs. Let us keep these programs working. But let us not add more and more and more. Where do we stop? Where does the all-powerful Central Government stop? Where do we stop abrogating our rights as States and communities and turn all of our problems over to the Federal Government?

Mr. Chairman, I will admit as a Member of the Congress who comes from a rather poor section of the country, Alabama, that I have to look back with pride upon how we solved some of our economic problems. We did so with hard work. We did so by pulling ourselves up by our bootstraps, because we do have bootstraps. We did it without any foreign aid from anyone, but with our own good minds and willing hands.

Mr. Chairman, I say that these people are wonderful people who live in the Appalachian area, people who will solve their problems. As I ride through the country I know that there are areas of unemployment. But I am not one of those who thinks that just because you put a slab of asphalt through a mountain road that is not now in too good condition that you are going to put an industry there.

Mr. Chairman, I served as president of the Associated Industries of my State. I have talked to a lot of men of industry about this great problem. One asphalt road will not bring an industry into any mountain area.

Mr. Chairman, I also know that we have a great problem of training people throughout the country. Surely they need training. My State, Alabama, is now in the process of undertaking a great program of building trade schools in which to train its people. We have been able to do that in spite of the fact that we have a lot of depressed areas on the map in the State of Alabama. We may be depressed in comparison to other areas of the country that are more wealthy. However, we are a proud people. We are working hard. We are producing enough taxes to become progressively one of the wealthier States of this Union.

Mr. Chairman, I watched as the map unfolded some of the counties which are located in the congressional district of my State which it is my privilege to represent. We have in the Appalachian region one section that we call Sand Mountain, a flat plateau of mountain area. It is one of the most productive farming areas in the United States. It is populated with mountain people who possess a lot of pride.

Mr. Chairman, I would hate for them to think that they wanted me to stand on the floor of this Congress and call them a people dependent upon the Federal Government and people who live there as depressed. They are not depressed. They have toiled with their hands and built a great land.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is making a very impressive statement, but I wonder if he knows that over \$500 million a year is going to relief and related programs in this region the gentleman represents for the cost of these people now?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I do not think this is going to solve that question. Can the gentleman prove it will take one man off the payroll?

Mr. GRAY. They have been depressed a long time. We would like to try something. I am not in the Appalachian region myself, but as a member of the Committee on Public Works I feel it is worth an effort to try to transfer relief checks into paychecks.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I agree with the gentleman we should try to get relief checks into paychecks. But I am a believer in the free enterprise system as the answer to this problem. I do not think you will solve the problem by this bill.

Mr. GRAY. I would like to point out again to the gentleman that it is costing \$500 million a year now. That is a lot of money.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. It is a lot of money, yes, but I think we are solving these problems in the framework of the free enterprise system of our country. You are not going to solve unemployment by passing an Appalachia bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois illustrate the fallacy, the proven fallacy, of the approach of the majority relating to depressed areas and unemployment in this country. We have heard assertions for the last 6 years now that the answer to unemployment is to spend Federal money. I recall the assertion that \$900 million spent in a period of about 18 months for an accelerated public works program in all these areas evidenced on the map, some 1,407 areas, was the answer to the problem. It was stated this would put people to work. It was proven it did not put them to work in any substantial quantity, and when it did put them to work it cost the taxpayer an average of more than \$10,000 per man-year.

I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there are new assertions in the programs proposed here as well as the ones already in existence. For instance, there is a request this year for fiscal 1966 for programs that have a relationship to combating poverty. I will ask unanimous consent to include a list of these in the Record at this point.

The material referred to follows:

TABLE 1.—Federal programs currently operating to combat poverty (as provided for in the budget for fiscal year 1966)

(NOTE.—These are Federal programs having the purpose or effect of helping to eliminate the causes of poverty or to ameliorate the conditions of poverty; many of these programs are aimed specifically at the poor, others are of a more general application.)

	Amount budgeted
Office of the President: Office of Economic Opportunity ¹	\$1,465.5
Department of Agriculture:	
Agricultural research (Hatch Act) ²	45.9
Cooperative extension (Smith-Lever Act).....	70.8
Farmer Cooperative Service.....	1.2
Economic Research Service ³	9.5
Special milk program ⁴	100.0
School lunch program ⁵	411.7
Food stamp program.....	100.0
Donation of commodities to needy persons (other than school lunch program) ⁶	197.1
Farmers Home Administration (rural housing grants and loans):	
Development loans.....	1.4
Grants.....	10.4
Loans to elderly.....	19.0
Building loans.....	11.0
Total.....	41.8
Rural renewal loans.....	3.0
Direct loan accounts ⁷	349.0
Real estate.....	49.0
Operating.....	300.0
Rural Community Development Service.....	0.1
Rental housing for elderly.....	5.0
Subtotal.....	1,335.1
Department of Commerce: Area Redevelopment Administration:	
Operations and technical assistance.....	4.1
Grants for public facilities (requires new legislation).....	10.5
Area Redevelopment Loan Fund.....	0
Subtotal.....	14.6
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:	
Office of Education:	
Vocational education acts ⁸	257.5
Student loan program (National Defense Education Act) ⁹	179.3
Science, mathematics, foreign language instructional equipment and audiovisual equipment for elementary and high schools (National Defense Education Act).....	79.2
Improved counseling, testing, and guidance in schools (National Defense Education Act) ¹⁰	31.7
Cooperative research and demonstrations.....	25.0
Education of handicapped children ¹¹	21.5
Vocational rehabilitation Administration:	
Vocational rehabilitation grants to States ¹²	124.0
Vocational rehabilitation research and training.....	45.8

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—Federal programs currently operating to combat poverty (as provided for in the budget for fiscal year 1966)—Continued
[In millions]

	Amount budgeted
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued	
Public Health Service:	
Chronic diseases and health of the aged ¹³	\$61.2
Communicable diseases.....	39.3
Community health practice.....	63.4
Hospital construction (amount here is that proposed for 5-year extension of Hill-Burton Act) ¹⁴	303.0
Environmental engineering and sanitation ¹⁵	15.9
Indian health activities ¹⁶	66.0
Social Security Administration:	
Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund payments.....	17,800.0
Unemployment compensation and employment services.....	492.1
Welfare Administration:	
Public assistance grants to States ¹⁷	2,966.4
Public Assistance Administration, services and training (grants to States) ¹⁸	295.7
Bureau of Family Services ¹⁹	6.2
Maternal and child welfare ²⁰	162.0
Office of Aging.....	7
Cooperative research for social security.....	2.0
Subtotal ²¹	22,937.9
Department of the Interior: ²²	
Indian education and welfare.....	106.8
Indian resources management.....	0.1
(Indians) construction of facilities and irrigation systems.....	70.0
Subtotal.....	176.9
Department of Labor:	
Manpower training and development.....	16.8
Unemployment Insurance Service and U.S. Employment Service.....	13.4
Subtotal.....	30.2
Housing and Home Finance Agency:	
Low-income housing demonstration programs.....	.1
Public facility loans (1965 capital outlay).....	100.0
Urban renewal grants.....	1,623.0
Low rent public housing grants.....	248.2
Low rent public housing development loans.....	646.8
Subtotal.....	2,618.1
Small Business Administration:	
Business loans.....	240.1
Investment and development company assistance; debenture purchase and loans.....	79.0
Subtotal.....	319.1
Total.....	28,897.4

¹ Includes the Job Corps, community action programs, migrant agricultural employees program, rural areas program, work experience program, adult literacy program, volunteer program, and general direction and administration

² Includes project for improving rural life.

³ Farm economics and marketing economics.

⁴ Whole milk for children in schools, day camps, etc.

⁵ Includes both commodities and cash payments.

⁶ The 1964 figure (1966 estimate not available) for donation of food for needy persons through public and private welfare and charitable agencies.

⁷ 90 percent of loans go to farmers with income of \$3,000 or less. Purpose identical to poverty act grants and loans to farmers.

⁸ Includes funds to Commissioner for direct help for culturally deprived youth (residential schools, workstudy, and special projects), also, State plans include heavy emphasis on out-of-school youth.

⁹ Specifically intended for needy but able college students fund is now meeting colleges' requests. States give priority to schools most in need of assistance to buy expensive equipment.

¹⁰ Key part of efforts to prevent school drop-outs.

¹¹ Program designed to prevent future dependency.

¹² These two programs heavily emphasize and assist in expanding, improving, and coordinating State and local services and facilities.

¹³ These programs (9, 10, 11) make a major contribution to State and local efforts to improve general health and to prevent, control, and treat disease.

¹⁴ Includes nursing homes, diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation centers, and project grants for comprehensive area plans for medical facilities.

¹⁵ Grant assistance to States, cities, industries, and researchers to eliminate health hazards from food and water.

¹⁶ Full range of health, medical, and hospital services for Indians and Alaskan natives; health education.

¹⁷ Payments to individual recipients, medical care for the aged.

¹⁸ A major purpose of these grants is to finance State and local programs to prevent dependency and causes of dependency.

¹⁹ Administers public assistance grants, coordinates Federal and State efforts, provides technical and other assistance for programs to prevent dependency.

²⁰ Grants to States, including research and demonstration for improved maternal and child health services (particularly in rural areas), child welfare services and crippled children's services.

²¹ Includes \$17.8 billion Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund payments (social security).

²² These three programs, plus Public Health Service health services, relate to nearly every phase of Indian life.

TABLE 2.—Existing Federal programs which overlap programs proposed in S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965—Amount budgeted for fiscal year 1966
[In millions]

Sec. 201—Appalachian Development Highway System: Federal-aid highway program:	
Interstate System.....	\$2,660.0
Primary system.....	440.0
Secondary system.....	296.0
Urban highways.....	246.0
Total.....	3,642.0

Sec. 202—Demonstration Health Facilities:

Title IV of the Public Health Service Act.....	260.0
Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act and the Community Mental Health Center Construction Act.....	22.0
Total.....	282.0

Sec. 203—Land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control:

Agricultural conservation program.....	250.0
Cropland conservation program.....	10.0

TABLE 2.—Existing Federal programs which overlap programs proposed in S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965—Amount budgeted for fiscal year 1966—Continued
[In millions]

Sec. 203—Land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control—Continued	
Conservation reserve program.....	\$150.0
Soil conservation service.....	218.0
Total.....	628.0
Sec. 204—Timber Development Organizations:	
Forest Service programs.....	340.0
Farmers Home Administration credit programs.....	248.0
Total.....	588.0
Sec. 205—Mining Area Restoration: The act of Aug. 31, 1954; the act of July 15, 1955; and the act of Oct. 15, 1962.....	1.2
Sec. 206—Water resource survey: Civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for surveys, research, and development of water resources.....	24.0
Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, general investigations, surveys, and studies on water resources.....	11.6
Total.....	35.6
Sec. 211—Vocational education facilities:	
The act of Mar. 1, 1931; the act of Mar. 18, 1950; the act of Aug. 1, 1956; the act of Sept. 25, 1962; the Vocational Education Act of 1946; and the Vocational Act of 1963.....	257.5
Sec. 212—Sewage treatment works: Sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for water supply and water pollution control.....	40.6
Federal Water Pollution Control Act construction grants.....	100.0
Subtotal.....	140.6
Sec. 214—Supplements to Federal grant-in-aid programs (those programs in addition to secs. 201-212):	
Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.....	5.7
Library Services Act.....	55.0
Federal Airport Act.....	75.0
Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.....	641.8
Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.....	125.0
National Defense Education Act of 1958.....	412.6
Total.....	1,315.1
Total.....	6,890.0

Mr. CRAMER. Including social security, it amounts to \$28.897 billion. Taking social security out, it is \$11 billion. Included in this aid to depressed areas and aid to unemployment this year, and in the bill we passed last year for the Office of Economic Opportunity, \$1,465,500,000 is requested for the assistance of unemployed people in the area of the Job Corps, the community action program, the agricultural program, the rural area program, work programs, the adult literacy program, and others, and

in the area of vocational education, a duplication of what is in this bill. In addition to that, \$100 million for the food stamp plan. You have the Manpower and Development Training Act program. There is also a figure in excess of \$300 million for the next 5 years for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act.

So I think the fallacy is obvious in the position of spending a few billion dollars for this, and this is a \$1.92 billion program for Appalachia alone, for the right-to-work program, pumping Federal money into everything might employ a few more people, even though the cost is far disproportionate to the people employed.

Would not the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. Does not the gentleman agree further that one of the clearest examples where, in my opinion, we are going to have a bigger abuse, you will have more political shenanigans, you will get less benefit as a result, is the access road program in the highway section, that permits them to build highways without any standard of construction, without any responsibility to maintain those highways for the first time in the history of Federal aid legislation. Without any requirement of maintenance they can build these access roads, a thousand miles of them, to any motel or hotel or business, golf course, or almost any other private facility, providing all that without limitation.

Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Yes; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLODY. I think the gentleman's remarks are really pertinent insofar as they discuss the fact that industry may or may not come into the area if they are provided with these benefits that the Appalachia bill would provide. I do not think there is any assurance that can be given in this kind of legislation that with all of the attractiveness, with the new highway construction and the other benefits that would be provided here, industry would go there.

I am reminded of the situation in Brazil, where the Brazilian Government undertook to construct a whole community called Brasilia out in the hinterlands with the idea that it was going to be a center of activities and was going to attract a lot of people there and provide a lot of benefits for the whole nation. It virtually destroyed the country, because of this great economic investment in that area and the fact that it was not attractive for industry or business or people to go there. The problems of the country have been monumental. The distress that has resulted from this effort on the part of the Brazilian Government has been far-reaching, practically to the point of destroying the nation itself as a nation.

I think this is the riskiest sort of governmental planning. It gives no real assurance that any benefits could come even to the area that is intended to be benefited.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. The gentleman from Illinois may not have attended the committee when the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] said something to the effect that the Duke Power Co., of South and North Carolina, has an application before the Federal Power Commission which, if granted, would call for the spending of almost as much money in the Appalachian area as this entire bill. It seems strange to me that we have the Federal Government here with one hand holding up the development of Appalachia, if the information given us by the gentleman from South Carolina is correct, and on the other hand pouring this largess in.

Is it true that 11 of the gentleman's 12 counties are in this area?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I should like to nominate the gentleman for the "Profiles of Courage" award. I admire the gentleman's courage, if 11 of his 12 counties are in this area and he has decided to vote against this bill. I hope that there are enough people in the gentleman's district that will recognize this courageous action the gentleman has taken. I hope this will be recognized far beyond the area of the gentleman's district. It is most refreshing to me to know there are still people here in the Congress who have the courage to vote their convictions instead of just voting their districts. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

In conclusion, I would remind the Members of this body that when we vote for this bill we should in good conscience, if we do vote for it, vote for bills for other areas. Since I am not of the view that we want to embark on another spending program for the entire United States, I cannot vote for my region and turn around and cast a vote for another region. Let us stop this trend of more spending. Let us stop this trend of doing now and putting our children in debt. When we have the money in the bank I am willing to do it, but not now.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the gentleman recall an amendment in committee when he tried to insert another county into the program?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I recall it because I wanted to bring out the unfairness to the gentleman and the other gentleman, that you had included counties of great wealth in my district but excluded one of extreme poverty. If I was not, under the circumstances the gentleman mentions, able to explain it sufficiently to you, how could I explain it to the people back home? I think if you

are going to use it for poverty, you ought to put it where poverty is.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the southern tier of New York State stretches for 350 miles from Delaware County on the east to Chautauqua County on the west. It is predominantly rural; covered with hills, some rolling and some jagged.

During the early months of the planning for this Appalachian program, New York participated. But after about a year, New York withdrew. In the early stages the 13 counties of New York, the southern tier, were included because geographically and economically they shared the characteristics of Appalachia. But when the Governor of New York withdrew, they were not included.

This omission I feel, Mr. Chairman, is contrary to the purposes of this bill which is to provide through regional planning and development. These counties certainly are part of the region of Appalachia. Now this omission was noted, as our distinguished colleague from New York pointed out earlier, by the junior Senator from New York. He introduced an amendment which was concurred in by the senior Senator from New York who proposed certain changes. The junior Senator accepted those modifications and the amendment was passed by the other body.

The amendment directs the Appalachian Region Commission to consider including the 13 southern tier New York counties. If, after consultation with New York, the Commission concludes that these counties share the social and economic characteristics of Appalachia and that their inclusion would further coordinate economic development of the entire region, it would then invite New York to participate. If the Governor of New York accepts, these counties would be included. Now there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that these counties do in fact share the social and economic characteristics of Appalachia and lag behind the rest of the Nation. They are poor. Two hundred thousand families in this area, 12 percent of the total, have incomes under \$2,000 a year. In Delaware, Allegany, and Oswego Counties, 15 percent of all families have incomes in this bracket. This is more like West Virginia than the neighboring counties in Pennsylvania. In West Virginia 17 to 18 percent have incomes under \$2,000 and in the neighboring counties of Pennsylvania there are only 11 percent. Now these facts have sad consequences. Young people more and more are fleeing from this region. In the Nation as a whole, 15 percent of our population are in the age bracket of 15 to 24. But in the southern tier of New York, only 12 percent of the population is in this bracket. The future of the southern tier of New York, like that of the Nation as a whole, lies in its youth. If the youth continue to flee from this region, the region will have no future.

This amendment definitely does not include the 13 counties because it is a voluntary program and the Governor of

our State despite the poverty that exists there has for some strange reason not seen fit to ask for their inclusion. But I believe that the door should be left open.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of this amendment have cited certain prosperity in this area; in Elmira, Binghamton, Jamestown, and Corning. It is true that there is prosperity, but I think that this is good for the overall bill. The fact that there are small pockets of prosperity tucked into this huge fabric of poverty does not change the case.

It strengthens the case, because these pockets of prosperity can be the affluent nuclei around which prosperous regional economies can be built. But modern arteries of concrete must be stretched out from these pockets of prosperity. The penetration of the southern tier of New York by an adequate transportation network is the first requisite of its full participation in industrial America. An adequate highway system is an absolute essential to economic progress in these rolling hills.

I urge retention of this amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE], a member of the committee.

Mr. KEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the 11 States of the Appalachian region had very serious economic problems of long-term duration. Because of these difficulties, the Governors met at Annapolis, Md., in 1960 for the purpose of finding out what could be done. These Governors requested the President of the United States to establish the President's Appalachian Regional Commission. This Commission was established on April 9, 1963.

This Commission included representatives of the Governors and a representative of the heads of major Federal departments and agencies, and it worked diligently to prepare a comprehensive program for the economic development of the region. The work of this Commission resulted in the legislative proposals we are considering on the floor of the House today.

In fact—this is one point which is absolutely clear and no man can deny it—these proposals came primarily from the Governors of the 11 States involved and not from the Federal Government.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I should certainly agree with the minority report on this bill that it would provide preferential treatment for one region, thereby discriminating against other areas with equal or greater need. In fact, my own Seventh District of Minnesota is a good example of areas that would certainly qualify for Appalachian funds according to the criteria put forth for such need. For instance, we are told

that in the Appalachian area 30.7 percent of the families earn less than \$3,000 a year, the statistical figure so often thrown about these days as the point of no return for the poverty stricken. In the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota, 37 percent of the families earn less than \$3,000 a year, but I have not heard anyone calling the area poverty stricken. The Seventh District needs realistic help in its efforts to improve its income level, but Appalachia is not going to do the job. In fact, the Appalachian Act will hurt such areas as the Seventh District of Minnesota.

This points out the wisdom of the minority who recognize the dangers and inherent unfairness of confining such sweeping aid to only one region of the Nation. This same minority also has proposed an alternative plan, a program for all of the Nation instead of just Appalachia. The Appalachian region, of course, would also benefit, but so would other areas of need. This Republican alternative recognizes the fact that if such large sums of money are to be spent, they should be available on an equal basis to all areas of need in this Nation.

One of the aspects of the bill before us today that has been noted in particular by the writers of the minority view concerns the section on highway construction. It is noted that 85 percent of the program is for highways, even though our National Highway System has been developed so that all of the States in the Union, on a time-tested formula, have shared in a fair manner in the Federal funds available for highway construction. But now, for the first time, 11 States are being singled out to receive \$840 million of special funds for development of highways and access roads. Some of those States are among the largest and wealthiest in the Nation.

I always thought that when you built a better mousetrap, the public would beat a path to your door. Under this Appalachian bill, we are going to beat the path to the door first.

A disturbing aspect of assistance for Appalachia in such a massive form is contained in statistics that are finally coming to the attention of the Congress. We are led to believe that Appalachia will never recover or approach the national income average without this bill.

Unfortunately, most of the statistics thrown around were taken from the 1960 census and do not reflect progress made in the last 4 years by the communities themselves, through private capital moving into the area due to the availability of manpower and natural resources. Recent reports show that the gap between Appalachian income and the U.S. average is narrowing. In West Virginia, for instance, unemployment dropped from 105,000 in 1961 to under 60,000 in 1964. Such progress is commendable, and reflects the basic spirit of America that has always believed that Washington's job is to do only what the private and local sectors cannot do. But I can imagine how much initiative there will remain for such improvement after Uncle Sam takes over the job, at the expense of the rest of the taxpayers in the Nation. We must not lose sight of the

fact that lasting prosperity is only created by policies encouraging expansion of job-creating, taxpaying enterprises.

Another section of the bill before us that concerns me is the section on land improvement, although the terminology has been changed to say "land stabilization, erosion, and sediment control, and reclamation through changes in land use, and conservation treatment." We should remember that this section was entitled, "Pasture Improvement and Development" in the Appalachian bill of the last Congress, and would have authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to landowners in amounts up to 80 percent of the costs of improving and developing 25 acres of pastureland owned by such landowner in the region.

The only difference between that bill and the one before us today is that the acreage per farm has been increased from 25 acres to 50 acres and that cropland is included with the pastureland as eligible for improvements. What this section does is to transfer the pockets of poverty from marginal farms in Appalachia out onto the plains of America where beef and other crops are already being overproduced. Our Government recently spent \$25 million to keep excess beef off the market, and we are already paying to keep 53 million acres of farmland out of production.

The relationship of the crop and pastureland improvement section of this bill on the rest of rural America is apparent. The Budget Director tells the rest of the Nation that 2½ million farmers must leave their lands because they are not "efficient" enough. But here in this bill we see this same administration attempting to set up another round of marginal farms to compete with the rest of the country, raising crops and commodities that already are in surplus. It is obvious that this scheme, like so many others we have noted in recent years, follows the very same pattern of transferring misery from one section of the Nation to another. You would think they would learn from past experience.

There is another aspect of this bill that does not make sense. Section 214 is, in effect, a reenactment of the discredited and ineffectual Public Works Acceleration Act for the Appalachian region. In fact, it is even worse than the forerunners, since this section provides for an increase to 80 percent for the Federal share of projects instead of the original 50 percent in the Public Works Acceleration Act.

Accelerated public works—APW—and the Area Redevelopment Administration—ARA—have long lists of dismal failures, unable to show any substantial reduction in unemployment actually attributable to the programs. Even the present administration appears to have deserted the continuation of these programs, which makes the inclusion in this bill even more strange.

ARA and APW are no strangers to Appalachia. ARA admitted last year that about 30 percent of its funds were spent in the Appalachian States, or that approximately 23 percent of the APW funds

were spent in Appalachian counties—without any apparent improvement in the employment picture attributable directly to such programs.

Add to this the fact that 76 of the Appalachian counties are not now eligible for grants under the Public Works Acceleration Act because they do not need it. But, under the Appalachian bill before us today, they would indeed become eligible.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the bill before us has too many deficiencies, that more thought is needed before this Congress or this Government can effectively combat poverty in this Nation. While I certainly am in favor of governmental efforts to assist our unfortunate citizens, I believe we need better programs than those offered in this bill that pours millions into a sweeping program for an isolated area. Let us reconsider.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill (H.R. 5577) to clarify the status of the Marshfield Clinic, Marshfield, Wis., for Federal tax purposes.

The Marshfield Clinic was incorporated in 1916 under the general business corporation law of Wisconsin. It has become a major economic factor in the community and a major medical institution in the State of Wisconsin.

During the almost 50 years of its existence, the clinic has operated as a corporation. During this period it has been taxed as a corporate employer. The doctors on its staff are salaried and have been treated as employees for withholding taxes, social security taxes, and unemployment compensation taxes, both State and Federal.

Coincidentally, the history of the Marshfield Clinic covers the same span of years as the Federal income tax. For some 49 years, no one has questioned its corporate existence for Federal tax purposes. At this late date, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has promulgated regulations with respect to so-called professional corporations which

would take away from the Marshfield Clinic its corporate status.

Although the regulations in question were directed at a different type of professional corporation, organized under special laws enacted in recent years, no effort was made to limit the impact of the regulations to that type of corporation. Instead, the regulations would refuse to recognize any professional corporation, regardless when or how organized. In adopting this position, the Commissioner would reverse the long-standing rulings of his predecessors in office that the Marshfield Clinic is a corporation and that its doctors are employees of that corporation.

The Marshfield Clinic was granted a corporate charter by the State of Wisconsin in 1916. That status has stood unchallenged for almost 50 years. No claim is made that there has been any change in the manner of its operations over those years which would justify a change in position on the part of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. No claim is made that the Marshfield Clinic has abused its corporate status, or that it was organized for purposes of tax avoidance, or that it is not conducting the business—the practice of medicine—for which it was organized. I have reviewed the matter with competent legal authority. Under these circumstances, all agree that the regulations are invalid as applied to the Marshfield Clinic. The clinic would unquestionably win its case in court. However, I do not feel that the clinic should be compelled to resort to the courts in order to enjoy a right which it has had unchallenged for almost 50 years.

My bill provides that the Marshfield Clinic shall continue to be treated as a corporation. It is limited in scope to organizations of long standing, such as the clinic. As a practical matter, the Treasury Department advises that there are no other known organizations which would meet the tests laid down in the bill. Accordingly, the bill will not affect the regulations, whether valid or not, insofar as the newly organized professional corporations are involved.

CLOSING OF VA FACILITIES

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I just read an interesting article in the Washington Post by Mr. Leslie Carpenter and I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of the Record after my speech.

In his article, Mr. Carpenter states in essence that the present announced closures of the Veterans' Administration facilities, including Fort Bayard in New Mexico, are only the beginning. Mr. Carpenter says that there is more misery coming and it will be spread around to a greater extent. Mr. Carpenter indicates that there is now a report by the Veter-

ans' Administration before the Bureau of the Budget which would reduce the Veterans' Administration regional offices to 15. Mr. Carpenter also asserts that there are about a dozen more Veterans' Administration hospitals which will probably be shut down in the not too distant future.

I hope the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee will ask questions of the Veterans' Administration to ascertain the names of the institutions to be closed in the next closings and the locations of the regional offices. Perhaps it would be enlightening to some of our colleagues because they, too, may soon be faced with the task of explaining why we are curtailing medical services to our veterans and, at the same time, are being asked to extend medical care to all citizens.

The column referred to follows:

NIXON CLEARS HIS DESK

There already are plenty of indications that Richard M. Nixon has started early to maneuver the 1968 GOP presidential nomination for himself but here is another: Nixon has arranged with his New York law partners to spend only Mondays at his legal desk, leaving the rest of the week for political activity.

In about 2 months, all the necessary papers will have been filed in the effort of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party to unseat Mississippi's four Democratic Congressmen. The FDP charges the Congressmen were illegally elected because Negroes were excluded from voting. Moderate Republican House Members, seeking to reverse the anti-Negro image Barry Goldwater gave the GOP, may team up with Northern liberal Democrats to give FDP a victory.

The behind-the-scenes reason Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat of Arkansas, did not appoint Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat of New York, to the famous McClellan Investigating Subcommittee is reportedly a conflict of interest in the TFX probe the subcommittee has not yet finished. McCLELLAN is known to have strong feelings about the way the contract for the airplane was awarded and is said to believe KENNEDY, as his late brother's foremost adviser, may have had a hand in the decision. KENNEDY had been expected to go on the subcommittee, which he served for a number of years as general counsel.

Convinced that a tax cut during prosperity makes good times better, President Johnson has his advisers looking for what to slash next, once the excise tax reduction goes through Congress. Best bet: a new tax deduction for parents with kids in college, permitting them to write off tuition and book costs. When students are self-supporting, they would get the tax break.

About a dozen more VA hospitals and 35 more VA regional offices will probably be shut down in the not too distant future. That promises more lightning and thunder in the White House-Capitol relationship and threatens President Johnson's goal to go down in history as the President who achieved record-breaking legislative victories.

Yet, Mr. Johnson is a determined man when it comes to saving Federal funds where possible. While Members of Congress applaud the objective in general terms, they draw the line when it hits their own voters back home.

The VA has obviously long squandered money and gotten away with it because the huge veterans organizations are among the most powerful lobbies in Washington, feared by Congressmen, Senators, and Presidents alike.

Despite this political fact of life, the President showed no mercy for congressional rank in the first order to shutter 11 VA hospitals, 4 veterans homes, and 17 regional offices. One hospital is in Miles City, Mont., home territory of Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD. Another is in Dwight, Ill., the State of Senate Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN. One of the regional offices is in Lubbock, Tex., hometown of House Appropriations Committee Chairman GEORGE MAHON.

The most miffed of all has been MANSFIELD, who notes that VA only recently described the Miles City hospital as one of the most efficient VA had.

Key Members of Congress say flatly that, because of the political heat and ill feeling, Mr. Johnson will give a little in the original order and agree to permit a few of the hospitals, perhaps two or three, to remain open for the time being. The Miles City facility would seem the most likely to be salvaged.

More orders will be coming, however. VA feels many of its hospitals are located in the wrong places and wants to get rid of them. It wants to build new ones, locating each in important medical centers where there is access to top specialists.

VA's opinion also is that the need for veterans hospitals is diminishing with the likelihood of medicare and with more and more veterans covered by private hospital insurance by their employers in industry and business. New, too, is VA's nursing home programs. Such care, which is all many veterans require, is cheaper than hospitalization.

VA had 67 regional offices before the Johnson order cut them to 50. Before the Budget Bureau now is a VA report that it can get along satisfactorily with merely 15.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in RECORD and include an article by Miss Linda Willis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction that I learned that a young lady from a small community, but a wonderful section of Colorado was chosen to represent our State in the annual Veterans of Foreign Wars nationwide Voice of Democracy Contest. The achievement of this girl, Miss Linda Willis of Mancos, Colo., may not receive the wide attention that some act of violence might command, but, to me, it is worth every bit of publicity that the media care to give it. It represents, Mr. Speaker, a reminder to all of us that the young people of this Nation are, indeed, worthy of our hopes for the future. I ask that my colleagues share my pride by discovering the excellence of Miss Willis' winning speech.

The speech follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Miss Linda Willis)

As citizens of the United States, we enjoy many privileges. We are able to speak freely, worship God in our own way, stand up for what we think is right, oppose what we believe is wrong, and choose those who govern us. All of these are examples of the rights and privileges provided for us as citizens of this Nation, and as citizens of our churches, schools, communities, and homes.

However, citizenship means duties and responsibilities as well as privileges. So if we do nothing, we are not effective citizens. The challenge comes in assuming our duties and responsibilities. What are these obligations?

John and Paul are typical Americans. They enjoy the same benefits of citizenship. But how do they approach its challenges?

One challenge of citizenship is to be concerned actively about the conduct of public affairs and to accept willingly responsibilities.

John works hard at his job as a factory foreman. More than that he is always alert for ways to improve operations. John always votes in elections and he knows why and for whom he is voting. He often attends meetings of his own political party. If he is asked to do something by his party chairman he accepts and completes the assignment promptly and to the best of his ability.

Paul works as a clerk in the offices of a large company. He follows his supervisors' instructions and obeys rules. But he cares little about his work. To Paul his job means only a pay check collected once a week. When elections are held, sometimes he votes and sometimes he does not. Usually if he does vote he does not know for whom or for what he is voting. When the chairman of his party asks him to do something he says that he simply does not have time.

Another challenge is to respect the human dignity and rights of others, and to learn to tolerate ideas that differ from our own. We should voice our opinion on the feelings we have, even though they may not agree with popular opinion. However, we should allow everyone else the same privilege of self-expression.

Let's see how John and Paul meet this challenge.

John does or says something constructive, rather than just complaining, when things go wrong or when someone disagrees with him. He treats other people as he would like them to treat him. He compromises when possible with others and respects their rights and opinions.

Paul claims up or shouts in defiance if someone disagrees with him. Paul is always right and everybody else is always wrong. He treats people as though they were inferior to him. He does not listen to others because he thinks he is the only one with something worth saying. He never compromises because he feels that that is admitting defeat and he does not believe that he can be defeated.

The third challenge of citizenship is to search for facts, interpret them, and use them constructively.

John learns about his country. He searches for facts such as the true heritage of the democracy in which he lives. He studies the facts that he has searched out and then with a clear and open mind, uses them to strengthen his citizenship.

Paul on the other hand, is too lazy to search for anything. He thinks he knows it all so he feels he shouldn't waste his time relearning something. He often doesn't interpret what he does know intelligently. He uses only the facts that will help him get ahead.

John and Paul, as citizens in their country, show what kind of citizens they are in their communities, homes, or churches and what kind of citizens they were in their schools. Why? Because they either meet the challenge of carrying out their duties and responsibilities or they do not.

Shall we be like John and raise our citizenship to new heights of excellence, or be like Paul and ignore the challenge?

I am a citizen and I can see,
That I must work to keep myself free.
What is my challenge then?
To stand for what I know,
Will help to make my country grow.

To search for truth, which makes us free,
And to tolerate the ones that disagree.
To have respect for someone else's ability,
To accept and complete all assignments willingly.

To try and accomplish all that I start,
In every way and everything, learn, to do my part.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL MAKES NUMEROUS AUDITS AND REPORTS ON WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE IN WIDE AREAS OF FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have had a continuing interest and concern in correcting and improving our foreign aid program, and have recently been provided with a report of the Comptroller General listing numerous instances in which irregularities have been shown to exist even in recent months in the foreign aid program.

The report from the Comptroller General comprises a listing of some 25 specific reports completed and a summary of 42 projects now in progress, as well as comments on other investigations being conducted by the Comptroller General of the United States.

The services of the Comptroller General are to be commended and I believe that this listing of investigations will be of much interest and concern to all Members. Under permission granted, I include the letter from the Comptroller General and the accompanying report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., February 23, 1965.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. EVINS: In view of the concern for our work relating to the foreign aid programs which you expressed during our appropriation hearings on February 18, 1965, we believe it may be of interest to you to have a more complete summation of the reports on these matters which we have submitted to the Congress during the past year and the principal areas in which we are currently working or contemplate in our work plans.

Attached for your use are (1) a listing of the 25 reports which we have issued to the Congress relating to the general subject of foreign aid since January 1, 1964, (2) a summary of 42 work projects which we now have in progress, and (3) comments concerning our further plans and some particular areas in which we intend to expand our efforts.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of
the United States.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORTS ISSUED TO THE CONGRESS SINCE JANUARY 1, 1964, RELATING TO THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS (Report title, reference number, and date issued)

EUROPE, NEAR EAST, AND AFRICA

Examination of certain economic development projects for assistance to Central

Treaty Organization (fiscal years 1957-62), B-146849, March 5, 1964.

Followup review of Department of Defense action to obtain reimbursement from foreign countries for administrative expenses under the MAP (letter report), B-146749, March 18, 1964.

Inefficient utilization of personnel to administer the military assistance program functions in advanced Western European countries (including a classified supplement), B-133280, April 2, 1964.

Furnishing of military assistance to Ethiopia in excess of the country's ability to effectively use the equipment (classified), B-146887, May 6, 1964.

Ineffective administration of U.S. assistance to Children's Hospital in Poland by the Agency for International Development and the Department of State, B-146787, June 17, 1964.

Examination of economic and technical assistance program for Turkey (fiscal years 1958-62), B-133026, June 30, 1964.

Followup review of Department of Defense action to cancel excessive procurement and redistribute aircraft spare parts programed for, or delivered to, Portugal under the military assistance program (letter report), B-146785, August 14, 1964.

Deficiencies in the military assistance program for the Spanish Army (classified), B-125086, August 25, 1964.

Inadequate consideration given to utilizing reserve fleet ships in lieu of providing new ships to Iran under the military assistance program (classified), B-133134, February 3, 1965.

FAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Review of the military assistance program for Indonesia (classified), B-146839, May 6, 1964.

Certain problems relating to administration of the economic and technical assistance program for Vietnam for 1958-62, B-133001, July 24, 1964.

Review of the administration of assistance for financing commercial imports and other financial elements under the economic and technical assistance program for Vietnam, B-133001, July 24, 1964.

Unofficial use and overstated needs of commercial-type vehicles by the military assistance advisory group and the headquarters support activity, Taipei, Republic of China, B-146907, July 31, 1964.

Review of the military assistance program for a Far East country (classified), B-146941, September 29, 1964.

Loss of interest on U.S.-owned foreign currencies in the Republic of China (Taiwan), B-146749, November 24, 1964.

Ineffective and overly costly aspects of military and economic assistance provided to Thailand (classified), B-132913 and B-133258, February 17, 1965.

LATIN AMERICA

Deficiencies in the administration of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile (including a classified supplement), B-146754, June 29, 1964.

Additional interest costs to United States because of premature releases of funds to the Social Progress Trust Fund administered by the Inter-American Development Bank, B-146937, September 8, 1964.

Improper payment of Colombian port charges for surplus agricultural commodities sold under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, B-146820, November 17, 1964.

WORLDWIDE OR GENERAL MATTERS

Audit for fiscal year 1963, Export-Import Bank, B-114823, February 20, 1964.

Unnecessary or premature procurement and delivery of Sidewinder missile training systems to foreign countries under the MAP (including a classified supplement), B-146762, March 12, 1964.

CXI—245

Undercollections of interest and principal in foreign currencies on certain loans to foreign governments, B-146928, July 17, 1964.

Improper retention of dollar collections on loans made by corporate development loan fund, B-133220, September 3, 1964.

Summary of deficiencies related to the inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to certain countries under the foreign assistance program, B-146943, September 28, 1964.

Excessive ocean transportation costs incurred under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, B-146820, October 30, 1964.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE WORK IN PROGRESS, FEBRUARY 18, 1965, RELATING TO THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

EUROPE, NEAR EAST, AND AFRICA

Expenditure of military assistance program funds for construction of the Shahabad Depot in Iran.

Transfer of dollars to Iran under the foreign assistance program.

Follow-up examination of certain aspects of U.S. assistance to the Central Treaty Organization for a rail link between Turkey and Iran.

Programming, delivery, and utilization of aircraft and related equipment furnished to the Pakistan Air Force under the military assistance program.

NATO cost sharing of military construction projects in Europe.

Administration of selected economic assistance projects and agreements in Iran.

Selected aspects of assistance to Ethiopia for airport facilities.

Grant of corn costing over \$23,700,000 to the United Arab Republic.

Disposition of military assistance program materiel in France.

Use of sales proceeds from excess military assistance program materiel in the United Kingdom.

Sales of tallow under Public Law 480, title I, to the United Arab Republic.

Potential commercial markets for wheat in the United Arab Republic.

Expenditure of U.S. dollars for bags provided to the United Arab Republic for use in distributing corn granted under title II of Public Law 480.

FAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Administration of a fixed communications system for the Government of Indonesia under the military assistance program.

Administration of military and economic assistance, Philippines.

Costs resulting from policy donating flour instead of wheat to voluntary relief agencies for distribution abroad under Public Law 480 (Taiwan).

Maintenance costs required to correct deficiencies in vehicles procured in Japan under the military assistance program.

Administration of agricultural market development activities in Japan.

Payments of living quarters allowances to certain military personnel on Taiwan.

Manpower utilized to administer military assistance in Japan.

Management of Nike Hercules missile systems furnished to the Republic of China (Taiwan) under the military assistance program.

Technical data received from Japanese vehicle manufacturers under the military assistance program.

Administration of U.S. assistance for selected development projects in Pakistan.

Management and utilization of commodities provided under the economic assistance program to the Republic of China (Taiwan).

Management of commodities provided to support the food-for-work program in Taiwan.

Management of local currencies owned or available to the United States in the Republic of Korea.

LATIN AMERICA

Dollar costs incurred in financing purchases of commodities produced in Brazil.

Costs incurred due to the use of an unfavorable exchange rate in converting dollars into Ecuadoran currency.

Administration of loans made to the Government of Costa Rica for budgetary support.

Justification of budgetary support loans made to the Government of Ecuador.

Administration of accommodation exchange service in Brazil.

Administration of the Public Law 480 program in Chile.

Payment of Colombian port charges for commodities donated under title III, Public Law 480.

WORLDWIDE OR GENERAL MATTERS

Administration of the training of foreign personnel under the military assistance program (Greece, Iran, Japan, Taiwan).

Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1964.

Utilization of excess personal property in foreign assistance program (Japan, Korea, Thailand, Taiwan, Germany, Turkey).

Practice of transporting overseas U.S. Government personnel to and from work (Korea, Philippines, Thailand, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Bolivia, Paraguay).

Ocean transportation costs for surplus agricultural commodities donated under titles II and III, Public Law 480.

Use of excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies to pay international air travel ticket costs being paid in dollars.

Use of excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies to pay costs of transporting personal effects of U.S. officials traveling overseas.

Administration of claims from foreign governments for recovery of ocean transportation costs financed under Public Law 480.

Audit of consolidated financial statements for AID lending activities.

RECAPITULATION

Europe, Near East, and Africa.....	13
Far East and south Asia.....	13
Latin America.....	7
Worldwide or general matters.....	9
Total.....	42

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE WORK PLANS RELATING TO THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

We plan to give increasing attention to activities or programs for which several agencies or departments have responsibilities, such as the activities relating to the food-for-peace program (Public Law 480), the utilization and management of U.S.-owned foreign currencies, and the use and disposition of excess property in relation to foreign aid programs. We expect to search for opportunities to reduce costs without adverse effect on the objectives of these programs and wherever possible to develop specific recommendations for improved management controls over them. We expect to focus attention to the fullest extent practicable on the management aspects.

In recognition of the increasing proportion of foreign aid to Latin America in relation to other parts of the world we plan to increase our application of effort in Latin America as a geographic area. This will be accomplished by staffs traveling from the United States without decreasing our efforts in the Far East or Europe.

Our continuing plans and test reviews must of necessity be flexible and selective in order to recognize and be responsive to areas of congressional interest, changing conditions, and relative significance of the many aspects of the foreign aid activities. Primary emphasis will be toward completing and reporting to the Congress on the assignments

we have already in progress. Further work proposed for 1965 and 1966 includes selective projects for reviews within the areas of the following:

1. Public Law 480 activities: Algeria, Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, specific elements affecting the program as a whole, such as transportation costs, foreign agents' commissions, budgetary controls, etc.

2. Administration of economic and military assistance: Brazil, India, Korea, Peru, specific elements of program management affecting more than one country, such as loan administration.

3. General:

Utilization and management of foreign currencies including top coordination among the several departments and agencies concerned, with test reviews in countries or of specific facets to be selected.

Excess property to be included as an element for consideration in reviews of economic and military assistance activities, and of AID management of excess property uses.

Followup of matters previously reported.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. I am pleased to notice that Miss Bonnie Ann Utter of Wheatland, Wyo., is the winner of this contest for my State and I am pleased to insert at this point in my remarks her excellent paper entitled "The Challenge of Citizenship."

Her rallying cry is to "stand tall" to live up to the responsibilities of being an American in today's world and it is indeed a challenge which should win the support of all.

The paper referred to follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Bonnie Utter)

Standing tall in the crowds, looking high in the sky, we are citizens and our challenge is greater than all others.

Fifty years ago our Nation was in the midst of a great and terrible conflict. In World War I almost 9 million lives were lost. Twenty-five years later we were caught in another battle—the second of the world wars. Thirty-six million lives were lost.

In 50 years, vast changes have come about. Our positions as citizens differ, for better and for worse, from the position of our fathers and grandfathers 25 and 50 years ago. But the challenge has not changed from that of our fathers and grandfathers. In 1914 the world was dominated by fears and by the ambitions of a few great powers. In the 1930's the world was confronted with the horrors of dictatorship and by the prejudices of one people against another. Today, in the sixties, we face all these crises and we must overcome them. Our capacity to face realities must be developed to allow us to settle disputes that would have led to a major war in the strained conditions of 1914. Our challenge is to meet today's dangers and deal with them in a common effort to quiet the fears, to turn ambitions into peaceful strength, to develop dictatorships into stronger governments and to kill the cancer of racialism.

Citizenship extends beyond our own doors to the doorsteps of people of other lands.

It is no longer morally or politically acceptable for advanced nations to ignore the backward helplessness of a less advanced nation. Ours is the obligation to avoid disaster and misery for ourselves and others. To prevent war is to not only save our country from untold sorrow but other countries also. Our challenge is to strive for peace for the good of all.

With peace as our goal, other great challenges are met too. Individual dignity as well as united strength develops with patriotism. We are able to stand in a crowd and be free and united in one person. We have the satisfaction of knowing that our brother standing next to us, be he white or black, has the same freedom of feeling that we have. With dedicated citizens comes a pride in national economic and political standards.

Our challenge is to evaluate the past, deal with the present and prepare for the future. If we answer our challenge we can stand tall and look up to a peaceful and prideful reward.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the fourth anniversary in the life of the Peace Corps. When President John Kennedy signed the Executive order for this agency on March 1, 1962, few of us anticipated the successes which the Peace Corps would achieve for the United States.

The successes are, indeed, many, and are meaningful. How many of us realized 4 years ago that we would have on this date requests from over 70 countries for Peace Corps volunteers? Even more, how many of us realized that almost 9,000 volunteers would be abroad in 46 countries, and that by the end of the summer we would have in training and at work almost 15,000 volunteers? It is a remarkable achievement for this Nation.

The concept and creation of the Peace Corps stands as a tribute to President Kennedy. It will be to President Johnson's lasting credit that he has so strongly supported an expansion of the capability of the Peace Corps by requesting legislation which will allow 17,000 volunteers to be put into training or actual service by the end of August 1966.

The complexities of balancing the interests of this country's citizens with those of other nations is a delicate one. As citizens and as Members of Congress, we face problems which require the fullest utilization of our energies and the strongest assertion of our leadership. We are continually looking for a better way to help freedom-loving nations around the globe. Some of the proposed solutions have not been as effective as we would like them to be—others have.

We realize that we may not find total answers, and that problems will continue to persist throughout our generation and beyond. In the Peace Corps programs, we have found, after 4 years, a partial answer to some of the complex problems

with which we are confronted. With the Peace Corps volunteers as our envoys, this country can demonstrate its sincere and worthwhile desire to exist with all nations without conflict. We can show that our citizens, from every corner of the United States, have a sincere desire to exchange ideas and to work for the betterment of our friends, to teach them, to help them improve their abilities to help themselves. The idea of the Peace Corps is relatively new in the histories of nations. In the long mark of time, the Peace Corps has not accomplished absolutes. The volunteers have not provided a total change or total development for the citizens of any country.

What it has done is begin, just begin, to show men and women in all parts of the world that we do want to help, in whatever way we are able. The Peace Corps has brought for some the first gleam of promise. It has shown the way for some people who have enjoyed no success, and who have little or no understanding of how to succeed. These Peace Corps volunteers who are living with the people of 46 nations bring with them some measure of ability to provide new ideas, new hope, and a new spirit. The 4 years of the Peace Corps have been just the start on a long pull. But these 4 years have provided a solid base for the further development of nations and the strengthening of friendships between nations.

I take great pride in having seen the Peace Corps come into being and become an integral part of our way of life here in the United States. I am glad to wish the best to the Peace Corps on its anniversary, and to extend my congratulations for its 4 successful years.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my esteemed chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], in calling to the attention of our colleagues the fact that today is the fourth anniversary of the Peace Corps.

It was 4 years ago that the late President John F. Kennedy signed into law the legislation establishing the Peace Corps organization. Many of us here today witnessed that historic event.

How short a time ago that seems. Yet in months since, the Peace Corps sent thousands of American men and women of all ages into foreign lands around the globe. Of those, many already have returned to enrich the fabric of American life with their experiences. Thousands more have taken their places and now labor abroad.

In 4 short years the Peace Corps has gone from an idea embodied in an act of Congress to an organization which enjoys the respect of all Americans and a worldwide reputation for accomplishment.

For this new agency, the 4 years have been busy ones and full of some difficult times. The achievements have been significant, however, and the praises deserving.

The concept of the Peace Corps is a unique one. Perhaps the concept can be illustrated through an old world proverb which has been repeated many times in this country. It goes something like this: If I give you a dollar, and you give me a dollar, we do not realize any gain; but if I give you an idea, and you give me an idea in return, then each of us has two ideas and we have truly made a profit.

This old saying illustrates what the Peace Corps has been doing in its 4 years. The agency is not intended to administer the exchange of material goods. The Peace Corps is designed to serve as a catalyst of ideas and ideals. With the volunteers' enthusiasm and desire as the magic ingredient, we are able to take small parts of this country's way of life and offer it to the people who want our help.

The volunteers are, in many ways, the reflection of what this country has best to offer its friends: an intense desire, an honest one, to take the extra step toward peace; to walk the extra mile to help our neighbors where we can; to journey down any road to do what we hope is our share of accepting the responsibilities of a successful nation.

I am advised there will be nearly 15,000 volunteers overseas by the end of this year. Their stock-in-trade is the good will of the American people. In their kit bags are the simple American tools of hard work, patience, some know-how, but more than anything else—a desire to help.

The Peace Corps is people to people. The volunteers get out into the villages and rural areas. They live in the crowded neighborhoods of the large cities. They shop in the marketplace, and work shoulder to shoulder with men and women in all levels of the communities.

The Peace Corps has a vitality which seems to be contagious. The number of applications for volunteer openings continues to grow, providing the source for a continued expansion. Rather than showing signs of middle age, I would say the Peace Corps is taking on the look of increased determination to do its job, confident with the knowledge that it has done a good job, and that it can do more.

In commemorating this notable occasion, I want to extend my sincere congratulations to Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver. He, more than any other individual, can be credited with organizing the Peace Corps, formulating its programs and guiding it through 4 years of successful operation.

Commendations must also go to the fine professional staff which Director Shriver has assembled. Both in the field and in the Corps' Washington headquarters, they have served with an enthusiasm and a dedication which is an example to all who serve in the Government of the United States.

Further, our Nation owes a debt of sincere gratitude to all those who are serving, or who have served, in the Peace Corps. These volunteers have left the comforts of their homes and the security of the familiar to work for the betterment of their fellowmen in far-off places of the world which are neither comfortable nor secure.

In doing so they have written a glorious, indelible page in American history. Long after the alarms and excursions of our own day are long forgotten, men will still be inspired and motivated by the sacrifices of these thousands of Americans.

Therefore, I am proud today to take note of the Peace Corps' fourth anniversary, to wish it happy birthday. I hope for its continued success, and wish its staff and volunteers Godspeed.

CLOSING DOWN OF VA HOSPITALS AND REGIONAL OFFICES—IT'S TIME FOR SOME ANSWERS

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks now a rumor has been circulating among Members of this House that VA closings announced January 14 were only the first in a series of wholesale closings of VA facilities. It would now appear that the cat is so far out of the bag that a syndicated columnist thinks he has good reason to state it in print.

I refer to the disturbing statements of the columnist, Leslie Carpenter, in his column "Washington Beat," appearing in the Washington Post of Saturday, February 27. That column not only reports that about a dozen more VA hospitals and many more regional offices will be shut down in the near future, but it also alludes to a Veterans' Administration report now pending before the Bureau of the Budget that the VA "can get along satisfactorily with 15 regional offices," a substantial reduction from the current 67 offices.

But that is not all. In this same story Mr. Carpenter points out that VA officials believe "the need for Veterans' Administration hospitals is diminishing with the likelihood of medicare."

Does this mean passage of a hospital insurance program will force all veterans to accept the limited and inadequate coverage provided therein? If so, we are about to witness a complete departure from the time honored concept of the role of the Veterans' Administration in providing full medical services to our aging and chronically ill veteran population.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a plan to reduce further the number of VA hospitals in this country by at least a dozen and reduce VA regional offices to only 15, and if there is some scheme in the planning stage to transfer some functions of the Veterans' Administration to Health,

Education, and Welfare or some other welfare agency after enactment of the proposed hospital insurance program, then Mr. Driver has a responsibility and a duty to spell out his plans right now before the Congress works its will on the proposed medicare bill—not several months or a year from now. If the reports of the Administrator's plans are correct, Congress should have an opportunity to provide adequate alternatives and safeguards for our aging veteran population under the initial provisions of any medical care bill that might be enacted.

If the VA Administrator is not inclined to come forward of his own accord with a clear statement of his long-range plans, then the members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs should interrogate him thoroughly, so that all Members of the Congress and the people of this country can know what measure of care our veterans can expect to receive in the future.

It is time for straight talk without any evasive answers. Let us find out now whether the Veterans' Administration is about to change its policy of providing full and adequate care for America's aging and disabled veterans.

FEDERAL TAX EXEMPTION FOR STATE AND LOCAL FINANCING OF INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL FACILITIES MUST BE ENDED

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit a joint statement by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and by myself, issued today in connection with the introduction of H.R. 5586, H.R. 5598, H.R. 5587, and H.R. 5599:

STATEMENT CONCERNING FEDERAL TAX EXEMPTION FOR STATE AND LOCAL FINANCING OF INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL FACILITIES

(By Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI and Congressman HENRY S. REUSS)

The Federal Government has long accorded to State and local governments the privilege of issuing tax-exempt securities to finance public facilities and services—like schools, hospitals, roads, and sewers. On such tax-exempt securities, the Federal Government foregoes tax revenues which are, in effect, subsidies to local governments. So long as these subsidies are for basic public purposes, the burden on the Federal taxpayer can be justified.

But when States, their subdivisions, or their dummy corporations issue tax-exempt securities to finance the construction of industrial or commercial facilities for sale or lease to private, profitmaking corporations, they are invading the private domain. Under the cloak of public purpose, they are merely funneling the benefits of cheaper, tax-exempt financing to private entities which have no right whatsoever to tax exemption. This raid on the Federal Treasury, through abuse of a tax privilege intended for other purposes, cannot be justified.

The cash benefits which a large corporation can receive from tax-exempt financing of industrial facilities are substantial. In the

first place, tax exemption reduces the cost of borrowing to build plants from 1 to 2 percentage points for even the most creditworthy industrial corporation. Secondly, by electing to lease rather than to purchase publicly financed facilities, the tenant can frequently charge off rental cost on a basis more advantageous than it can by taking depreciation on self-financed facilities. Also, as a lessor rather than an owner of industrial property, a corporation can avoid paying property taxes. Thirdly, by itself purchasing the tax-exempt securities, a corporation can earn tax-exempt income while it enjoys a lower rental cost due to tax-exempt borrowing.

THE RACE TO MISUSE LOCAL TAX-EXEMPTION PRIVILEGES

Until the mid-1950's, few States had provided themselves or their subdivisions with the authority to issue tax-exempt bonds for industrial purposes. But from about 1957 on, the race has been on. States, cities, towns, villages, development agencies, and even artificially created "municipal" districts have scurried to avail themselves of this key to the Federal Treasury.

As late as 1960 only nine States had legislation permitting local governments or their creatures to engage in tax-exempt industrial financing. Today, 27 States have passed such legislation. The local communities of less than 10 States are using the authority today in a substantial way. But soon, local governments of every State in the Union may feel they must do likewise in self-defense.

The volume of tax-exempt industrial financing undertaken by States and local governments has climbed alarmingly in the past few years. A recent University of Wisconsin study puts the total to date at around \$1 billion. This total is likely to continue to grow at an accelerating rate. Not only will more localities get into the act. The size of individual issues can be expected to increase. The reason is that the device of the tax-exempt industrial revenue bond enables even tiny communities to market huge issues—issues based on the credit ratings of beneficiary corporations rather than the credit ratings of the issuing public entity.

Here are some recent examples of large-scale diversions of tax-exemption benefits to major corporations:

1. Cutler-Hammer Corp. of Milwaukee: On March 12, 1964, this Milwaukee company announced that it would move a part of its manufacturing operations to Bowling Green, Ky., sometime in 1965. Some 750 skilled workers will lose their Milwaukee jobs as a result. While the company stated that lower wages and taxes in the new location were responsible for its decision, an important reason was the offer by the city of Bowling Green to build a new factory for the company. The city council on March 13, 1964, voted to authorize the issuance of \$6,500,000 in tax-free revenue bonds for use to build a plant for Cutler-Hammer Corp.

2. Harvey Aluminum Co.: In October 1963, Lewisport, Ky., announced a \$50 million revenue bond issue to build a new aluminum rolling mill for Harvey Aluminum Co. This is like a goat trying to carry an elephant. Harvey Aluminum enjoys \$75 million per year annual sales. It is the fifth largest aluminum producer in the United States. Lewisport, Ky., is a community of 780 persons on the Ohio River. How was Lewisport able to find buyers for its huge bond issue? Though Lewisport can confer its tax exemption privilege on the bonds, Harvey Aluminum's soundness as a business was the indispensable ingredient for making the bonds attractive to investors. One of the company's bankers, the Bank of America, headed a syndicate to take up an \$8 million share.

3. R. H. Macy & Co.: Macy's, the well-known New York department store, suggested to the city of Topeka that Macy's buy land in downtown Topeka, build a store and a 300-car parking garage, and then sell the whole thing to the city, on a lease-back arrangement. To pay for this purchase, the city offered to issue a tax-exempt \$3,700,000 revenue bond, and to rent the facilities to Macy's for 40 years. Since the city will own the building, Macy's will not be subject to real estate taxes for 10 years. In lieu of these taxes, it is reported that Macy's will pay Topeka about \$50,000 annually for 40 years on a prime downtown location.

ECONOMIC DANGERS OF LOCAL TAX-EXEMPT INDUSTRIAL FINANCING

The economic effects of local tax-exempt industrial financing are no less objectionable than its effect on the Federal tax structure. The do-it-yourself system of diverting Federal funds to private enterprises avoids the inconvenience of having to obtain the consent of the Federal Government. But it is a costly and self-defeating way to stimulate industrial development for the local communities concerned as well as for the Nation as a whole.

1. It undermines Federal economic programs for local development.

The Federal Government is concerned not only to keep the economy as a whole expanding through general economic policies like the tax cut. It is also very much concerned with the special problems of States and localities with high and persistent unemployment. To this end, the area redevelopment, small business, and accelerated public works programs were devised, and there is now pending a new general program for the multi-State Appalachian region.

In each of these programs it is an objective to help particular areas in ways which will not create distress in others. For example, both the area redevelopment and public works programs expressly prohibit the use of Federal funds for plant pirating and the export of unemployment to presently healthy areas. It is the aim of all these programs to establish and to encourage industrial development which is appropriate for the resource base of a given locality and economically beneficial for the country as a whole.

But efforts to administer Federal programs in a responsible manner will be undermined if an increasing number of local governments help themselves to Federal funds. Few States require their local units to observe standards approaching those of Federal programs, and local governments themselves show no disposition to go in for self-denying guidelines.

2. It encourages plant pirating. With the lure of tax-exempt financing, major companies can be enticed away from their present locations. When this happens, unemployment, reduced purchasing power, higher welfare costs, and a reduced tax base are the lot of communities losing plants.

The Milwaukee Association of Commerce estimated that the loss of 750 manufacturing jobs due to the shift of Cutler-Hammer operations from Milwaukee to Kentucky would result in losses of \$5,325,000 in personal incomes; \$2,482,500 in retail sales; \$1,717,500 in bank deposits; and nearly 500 additional jobs in trade, services, and other nonmanufacturing occupations which depend on the good incomes earned by Milwaukee's manufacturing workers. This is a high price to pay for the development of industry in Kentucky.

3. It encourages uneconomic plant location. Even when the pirating of existing facilities does not take place, local governments acting independently can bring about uneconomic location of new industrial capacity. When the powerful cost incentives of tax-exempt financing are thrown into the balance, businesses can be tempted to pass up locations better suited to their future

expansion. This is tantamount to plant piracy postponed to the future. It ill serves the Nation faced with the problem of providing for productive employment of millions coming into the labor force in the years immediately ahead. This will be possible only if the economic base is strong and healthy and able to grow under all competitive conditions, without the prop of public subsidy.

4. It encourages costly, self-defeating bidding for plants.

Interstate competition for industry through the subsidy route is costly and self-defeating. If established industrial areas lose existing plants or fail to get their share of new plants, they also will be driven to pay out subsidies. This in turn will push communities gaining plants to raise the ante on subsidies to hold their gains.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, which has been concerned with this "war between the States," predicted in a December 1963, report that the step following tax-exempt financing might be interest-free loans to corporations. And, then, it said, outright capital gifts might be necessary.

This beggar-thy-neighbor competition can only result in beggaring all the participants.

5. It erodes the tax base of local government.

The direct cost of payments to private businesses will be only part of the cost of this type of competition for industry. As more and more industrial property moves into State ownership, the tax base of States and local communities is diminished. Meanwhile, the demand for public services will continue to go up sharply. This means higher local taxes on individuals and businesses not enjoying subsidy privileges.

More pressure will be placed on Federal taxpayers to increase their direct aid to State and local governments to meet the needs for more schools, more hospitals, more utilities, and other public services.

6. It aids low-wage, nonunionized areas.

The whole country loses when job security rights and good wages obtained through collective bargaining are canceled by departures of large corporations to small, nonunionized, low-wage areas. If this happens in the normal course of competition, it is regrettable but not the responsibility of the Federal Government. But if it happens with the aid of Federal subsidy, the Government must recognize that its economic power is being used in an undesirable way.

7. It weakens the private enterprise system.

When local governments use tax-exempt funds to construct plants for corporations and retain ownership of the plants over the lifetime of 20- to 40-year leases, they distort and weaken basic features of the free enterprise system.

State ownership of plants run for profit is itself a big step toward socialism and alien to the private enterprise system. More subtle damage occurs to established businesses when a few of them get large tax subsidies that are denied the rest. This is especially true when local governments hand over the windfall gains of tax-exempt financing to the biggest, best heeled corporations which already have financial and economic advantages over their competitors. Furthermore, the withdrawal of such corporations from the normal private capital market weakens the corporate bond market. At the same time, the municipal bond market dealing in ordinary public issues of States and their subdivisions is thrown into chaos by the hybrid corporate bonds purporting to be municipals.

RESPONSIBLE OPINION AGAINST TAX-EXEMPTION FOR INDUSTRIAL FINANCING

Responsible opinion is lining up against the abuse by local governments of the Federal tax-exemption privilege to subsidize private businesses.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, established by Congress in 1959 and composed of a blue-ribbon group of State Governors, mayors, Congressmen, and other public officials made a major study of the problem in 1963.

Opposition to the tax-exemption abuse or warnings against the practice have been expressed by the Investment Bankers Association, the National Association of Counties, the American Bar Association, the Municipal Finance Officers Association, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Barron's and the Bond Buyer have condemned the practice in strong editorials.

The Area Redevelopment Administration, charged with the duty of increasing industrial employment in depressed local communities, is opposed to the practice of offering tax-exempt financing to lure industries to those areas. Mr. Victor Roterus, Economic Adviser to the ARA Administrator, said in his April 20, 1964, speech to the State Fiscal Officers' convention in Atlanta:

"ARA is definitely against the use of the device. Growing usage of this device—particularly its adoption by relatively prosperous urban areas—can result only in non-productive raiding of industries at the outset, and ultimately in a more or less equalized competitive situation among the areas. In such a situation, no one benefits and, indeed, everyone suffers because public tax revenues have been sacrificed and normal taxing and tax burden patterns have become disorganized.

"Factory raiding by one area at the expense of another by and large merely creates a new economic problem in the attempt to solve an old one. The practice, from the national viewpoint, is largely nonproductive and disrupting, and tends to provoke rancor among the various sections of the country.

"The effect of the bond device on the relations between various areas is no less disquieting. The use of tax-exempt bonds to build factories puts an unwarranted strain on Federal practices to equalize educational opportunities and other public services, and tends to distort these patterns to the point where compensating adjustments in policy may be occasioned."

In an appearance before the House Banking and Currency Committee on February 9, 1965, Treasury Secretary Dillon said that in his opinion, the use of tax-exempt bonds for industrial purposes was "a dangerous practice, and it would be wise for Congress to put an end to it." The Secretary said that the area redevelopment and the proposed Appalachia programs are the proper ways to bring new industry into depressed areas and not "indiscriminate use of the tax system." He agreed that unless the issuance of tax-exempt bonds for industrial development were curtailed by congressional action, "sooner or later, it is perfectly inevitable that practically every State will adopt this procedure." He went on to say that this competition among States would result in a "substantial erosion of Federal revenues."

Chairman Gardiner Ackley, of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, stated to the Joint Economic Committee on February 19, 1965:

"I think it does appear to be a problem and I would—if it is feasible, it sounds to me as though Secretary Dillon is on the right track in suggesting that this is a problem which may require legislation."

Budget Director Kermit Gordon, in response to a question during Joint Economic Committee hearings on February 23, 1965, replied:

"I must say that it strikes me as an individual that this may well be a quite questionable use of the tax exemption authority and there is a question in my mind as to whether the whole purpose of tax exemption was meant to extend to this kind of borrowing."

The West Allis Chamber of Commerce of the city of Milwaukee unanimously adopted a resolution condemning tax-exempt financing of industry and requesting remedial legislation by the Congress. The text of the resolution follows:

"Whereas the use of tax exempt State and local government securities continues to become more widespread; and

"Whereas this practice compels other communities to adopt the same procedures to be able to remain competitive in the field of attracting new industry and the expansion of existing plants; and

"Whereas industry raiding by one area at the expense of another, creates a new economic problem, is nonproductive, disrupting, tends to provoke rancor among States and municipalities and in addition, public tax revenues are sacrificed; and

"Whereas the continued intervention of government in business decisions, weakens the free enterprise economy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the West Allis Chamber of Commerce again reiterate, its support of the free enterprise system particularly when government intervenes to affect entirely industry decisions; and be it further

Resolved, That the preferable course of action is to apply solutions that are built upon the firm foundation of a private enterprise economic system, which would result in a strengthening of individual initiative and incentive, free competitive markets and limited government; and be it further

Resolved, That the West Allis Chamber of Commerce urge the Wisconsin congressional delegation to seek immediate remedial legislation in the 89th Congress, which would halt this undesirable, disruptive trend on the part of government; and be it finally

Resolved, That the West Allis Chamber of Commerce seek widespread support of other organizations in implementing the purposes of this resolution."

PROPOSED ACTION

There are two ways in which tax-exempt industrial financing can be stopped while the traditional tax immunity of State and local financing for public purposes is safeguarded.

One way, which seeks to impose indirect curbs, is set forth in H.R. 5586 and in H.R. 5598, which we have submitted today. These bills provide that whenever proceeds from a tax-exempt bond issue are used to construct facilities for sale or lease to private, profit-making firms, firms occupying such facilities may not deduct rent or other payments related to the use of the facilities in computing their Federal income tax liability.

The second way is incorporated in H.R. 5587 and in H.R. 5599, also submitted today. These bills take the direct approach and provide that tax exemption shall be removed on State and local obligations to the extent that proceeds of any issue are used to construct industrial or commercial facilities for sale or lease to private profitmaking enterprises. Purchasers of such securities can be assured of the extent to which tax exemption applies through a certification procedure stipulated in the bills. Further, it is stipulated that the removal of the tax exemption applies only to funds used to build and equip factory buildings and not to the purchase of land. This distinction is made to protect local governments in activities such as the urban renewal or land bank programs where purchase of land is required for public purposes. There is also added a provision to make clear that the removal of tax exemption under the circumstances detailed in the bill in no way encroaches upon the privilege of States and their subdivisions to enjoy continued tax immunity on securities issued for traditional public purposes.

We express no strong preference for either approach. Each has strengths that the al-

ternative does not. We believe that during committee hearings, the proponents of each approach should be heard. The important thing is that the Congress should act promptly to end the growing abuse of the tax-exemption privilege.

H.R. 5586

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 276. CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO ISSUER OF TAX-EXEMPT OBLIGATIONS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—No deductions shall be allowed for any amount paid or accrued (including interest on a mortgage and taxes) to a State, the District of Columbia, a possession of the United States, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, relating to the use or occupancy of an industrial or commercial facility acquired, constructed, or improved (in whole or in part) out of the proceeds of industrial development obligations.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL FACILITY.—The term 'industrial or commercial facility' means any building or equipment—

"(A) which is or will be used primarily for the mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale of articles or commodities (including any building or equipment the use of which is incidental to such mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale), and

"(B) a substantial portion of which has been or will be sold or leased to nonpublic enterprises. Such term does not include land (or interests in land).

"(2) INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OBLIGATION.—The term 'industrial development obligation' means any obligation which is issued (whether before or after the acquisition, construction, or improvement of the industrial or commercial facility involved) by a State, the District of Columbia, a possession of the United States, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, to finance directly or indirectly the acquisition, construction, or improvement of an industrial or commercial facility, and the interest on which is wholly exempt from the taxes imposed by this subtitle. For purposes of the preceding sentence, where a State or other governmental unit borrows money through a bank loan or otherwise, such governmental unit shall be treated as having issued an obligation at the time of such borrowing."

(b) The table of sections for part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 276. Certain payments to issuer of tax-exempt obligations."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act, and only in the case of amounts paid or accrued with respect to the use or occupancy of an industrial plant acquired, constructed, or improved with the proceeds of industrial development obligations issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 5598

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 276. CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO ISSUER OF TAX-EXEMPT OBLIGATIONS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—No deduction shall be allowed for any amount paid or accrued (including interest on a mortgage and taxes) to a State, the District of Columbia, a possession of the United States, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, relating to the use of occupancy of an industrial or commercial facility acquired, constructed, or improved (in whole or in part) out of the proceeds of industrial development obligations.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL FACILITY.—The term 'industrial or commercial facility' means any building or equipment—

"(A) which is or will be used primarily for the mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale of articles or commodities (including any building or equipment the use of which is incidental to such mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale), and

"(B) a substantial portion of which has been or will be sold or leased to nonpublic enterprises. Such term does not include land (or interests in land).

"(2) INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OBLIGATION.—The term 'industrial development obligation' means any obligation which is issued (whether before or after the acquisition, construction, or improvement of the industrial or commercial facility involved) by a State, the District of Columbia, a possession of the United States, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, to finance directly or indirectly the acquisition, construction, or improvement of an industrial or commercial facility, and the interest on which is wholly exempt from the taxes imposed by this subtitle. For purposes of the preceding sentence, where a State or other governmental unit borrows money through a bank loan or otherwise, such governmental unit shall be treated as having issued an obligation at the time of such borrowing."

(b) The table of sections of part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 276. Certain payments to issuer of tax-exempt obligations."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act, and only in the case of amounts paid or accrued with respect to the use or occupancy of an industrial plant acquired, constructed, or improved with the proceeds of industrial development obligations issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 5587

A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress and the purpose of this legislation—

(1) to encroach in no way whatsoever upon the rights of the States and local governments to issue for any purpose which may be a public purpose obligations the interest on which is wholly exempt from Federal income taxation, but

(2) to provide that a similar exemption will not continue to be available for subsidizing the financing of industrial and commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises.

SEC. 2. Section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) OBLIGATIONS TO FINANCE INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL FACILITIES.—

"(1) INCLUSION IN INCOME.—Notwithstanding subsection (a) (1), where part or all of the amount which the issuing authority receives from the issuance of an obligation described in subsection (a) (1) is to be used for industrial development purposes, a like percentage of each interest installment on such obligation shall be included in gross income. For purposes of the preceding sentence, where a State or other governmental unit borrows money through a bank loan or otherwise, such governmental unit shall be treated as having issued an obligation at the time of such borrowing.

"(2) CERTIFICATION BY ISSUING AUTHORITY TO BE FINAL.—For purposes of this subsection, a certification by the issuing authority—

"(A) that no part of the amount received from the issuance of an obligation is to be used for industrial development purposes, or

"(B) specifying the percentage of the amount received from the issuance of an obligation which is to be used for industrial development purposes, shall be final and conclusive.

"(3) USE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES.—

"(A) For purposes of this subsection, an amount is to be used for industrial development purposes to the extent it is to be used to finance directly or indirectly the acquisition, construction, or improvement (whether occurring before or after the issuance of the obligation) of one or more industrial or commercial facilities.

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'industrial or commercial facility' means any building or equipment—

"(i) which is or will be used primarily for the mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale of articles or commodities (including any building or equipment the use of which is incidental to such mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale), and

"(ii) a substantial portion of which has been or will be sold or leased to nonpublic enterprises.

Such term does not include land (or interests in land)."

SEC. 3. The amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall apply only to obligations issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 5599

A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress and the purpose of this legislation—

(1) to encroach in no way whatsoever upon the rights of the States and local governments to issue for any purpose which may be a public purpose obligations the interest on which is wholly exempt from Federal income taxation, but

(2) to provide that a similar exemption will not continue to be available for subsidizing the financing of industrial and commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises.

SEC. 2. Section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) OBLIGATION TO FINANCIAL INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL FACILITIES.—

"(1) INCLUSION IN INCOME.—Notwithstanding subsection (a) (1), where part or all of the amount which the issuing authority receives from the issuance of an obligation described in subsection (a) (1) is to be used for industrial development purposes, a like percentage of each interest installment on such obligation shall be included in gross income. For purposes of the preceding sentence, where a State or other governmental unit borrows money through a bank loan or otherwise, such governmental unit shall be treated as having issued an obligation at the time of such borrowing.

"(2) CERTIFICATION BY ISSUING AUTHORITY TO BE FINAL.—For purposes of this subsection, a certification by the issuing authority—

"(A) that no part of the amount received from the issuance of an obligation is to be used for industrial development purposes, or

"(B) specifying the percentage of the amount received from the issuance of an obligation which is to be used for industrial development purposes, shall be final and conclusive.

"(3) USE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES.—

"(A) For purposes of this subsection, an amount is to be used for industrial development purposes to the extent it is to be used to finance directly or indirectly the acquisition, construction, or improvement (whether occurring before or after the issuance of the obligation) of one or more industrial or commercial facilities.

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'industrial or commercial facility' means any building or equipment—

"(i) which is or will be used primarily for the mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale of articles or commodities (including any building or equipment the use of which is incidental to such mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale), and

"(ii) a substantial portion of which has been or will be sold or leased to nonpublic enterprises.

Such term does not include land (or interests in land)."

SEC. 3. The amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall apply only to obligations issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

COMMENDATION TO EDITORS OF THE DAILY NORTHWESTERN

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, there is poetic justice in the fact that com-

plaints of college students have caused Federal, county, and city authorities in Seattle, Wash., to launch an investigation of an automatic device which appears to be tailored to encourage classroom cheating by U.S. college students.

I commend the editors of the Daily Northwestern, student newspaper of Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., for their series of articles exposing the sale by mail of this device. Their action shows that the quality of honesty is not strained among all the students of our universities.

While these particular students attended Northwestern University, I am certain they could just as well have been enrolled at any one of our universities. This incident demonstrates that American college students are quick to see a challenge to their integrity and character.

I am especially pleased to commend Al From, editor of the Daily Northwestern and a native of South Bend, Ind., in my congressional district, for his fine efforts in this public disclosure, and I want also to salute Andrew H. Malcolm for his outstanding contribution to college journalism.

The editors of the Daily Northwestern first learned of the "PockeTutor" when a Northwestern freshman told them of receiving a pamphlet in the mail advertising a battery-powered, pocket-viewing study-aid device that propels a self-transcribed tape past a viewing window.

The pamphlet stated:

You may study at a moment's notice since you carry it with you in your pocket or handbag. By simply glancing at the viewing window, you study material, formulas, equations; text items can be easily visible to you, even without others knowing * * * PockeTutor can put you at the top of your class.

The producer listed a Seattle address.

The pamphlet pictured the device as barely larger than a package of cigarettes—comfortable, use in shirt or pocket pocket.

In addition to the "PockeTutor," listed for sale at \$19.95, the pamphlet advertised a wristwatch control accessory which affords an ultimate of convenience and ease of operation—requires only a tilt of the wrist to start or stop the viewing tape.

Mr. Malcolm's articles, which led to the investigation of the "PockeTutor" follow:

[From the Daily Northwestern, Feb. 19, 1965]
WEST COAST FIRM BUILDS MACHINES TO STOP
AWFUL CHEATING SCANDALS

(By Andrew H. Malcolm, assistant managing editor)

American capitalism has done it again. It has developed a product to eliminate the type of cheating exposed recently at the Air Force Academy.

Not by eliminating the cheating. But by eliminating the catching.

A west coast firm has built and is selling a tiny, battery-powered machine "barely larger than a package of cigarettes" which fits in a shirt pocket and is controlled by a switch under the student's wristwatch (honest).

THE POCKETCHEATER

To avoid libel problems (this is for real), we'll change the product's name to "the Pocketcheater."

The firm calls the mechanism "truly a dramatic breakthrough in easier learning through repeated exposure of facts, drawings, figures under direct, immediate viewing."

The company's slogan goes: "Better Grades Through Study Aids."

Before an exam all a student must do is write answers, equations, verb forms, or anything on a small tape. When he flicks his wrist, the tape winds slowly and silently past a viewing window on the top of the packet.

Thus all you need to do is casually bend your wrist and look down. Then when the answer passes by the window, you unbend your wrist. And you've got an A.

The firm has evidently sent out flyers to several Northwestern University students. These colorful pamphlets proclaim Pocketcheater "can put you at the top of your class."

FILLS "UNUSUAL NEED"

According to its builders, Pocketcheater (which sells for \$19.95) "can fill an unusual need of memory requirement in many fields and assist in quick results a great variety of ways."

And for an extra \$9.95 the company will include a fake wristwatch which controls the mechanism. It even has different speeds, probably one for mid-terms and one for longer finals.

"Now you can study or memorize on impulse," the pamphlet says. And it adds: "By simply glancing at the viewing window, your study material, formulas, equations, text items can be easily visible to you, even without others knowing."

"You will study during moments you might otherwise find wasted."

And as for coeducation schools: "Women students slip it into your purse or handbag for handy use anywhere."

With the Vietnam situation the way it is, the only patriotic thing to do is mail in your check and get your Pocketcheater so you won't flunk out and get drafted.

[From the Daily Northwestern, Feb. 23, 1965]
AT DAILY NORTHWESTERN PROMPTING: SEATTLE
BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU WILL PROBE
"TUTOR"

(By Andrew H. Malcolm, assistant managing editor)

The Seattle, Wash., Better Business Bureau, prompted by a Daily Northwestern inquiry, promised to open a full-scale investigation today of a mail-order firm's selling pocket-size "visual prompters" to college students.

Frank J. Zeorlin, the bureau's director, told the Daily Monday he would begin the investigation this morning.

The visual prompter, called PockeTutor, sells for \$19.95. Its makers, Study Aid Products, list a Seattle address. Several Northwestern students received hand-addressed brochures by mail last week.

Described as "barely larger than a package of cigarettes," the battery-powered machine fits in a shirt pocket and can be controlled by a switch under a fake wristwatch.

TRANSPARENT WINDOW

When a student bends his wrist, a roll of paper (with equations, formulas, or anything on it) unwinds past a transparent window on the top of the package. The machine has obvious possibilities for cheating on exams, though no such mention is made in the advertisement.

Zeorlin, reached by telephone at his Seattle home, said the first step in the investigation would be to check the bureau's downtown files. Offices were closed Monday for George Washington's Birthday.

HADN'T HEARD

"I haven't heard of this company," Zeorlin said.

He said that his staff would consult with Seattle police.

"I don't like the looks of this," Zeorlin said after hearing a description of the product and the brochure sent to Northwestern University students.

"This isn't good for students, business, or Seattle. And we, along with the bunko squad, will take a close look at the operation in the next couple days."

The Daily first learned of the project when a Northwestern University freshman told of receiving the pamphlet in the mail. All Northwestern University students who have received such brochures should notify the Daily, campus 3200 or 475-6455.

Some North Shore State legislators also expressed interest in investigating the product.

PROMISES INVESTIGATION

Representative John A. Kennedy, Democrat, of Winnetka, said he would investigate the possibility of a State law against such products or similar advertising. "Personally, I think this is the kind of thing that should be brought before the State senate and house," he said.

"If we can't stop its sale, at least we can warn people and control its advertising."

In its advertisements the company claims "PockeTutor Can Put You at the Top of Your Class." And adds, "text items can be easily visible to you, even without others knowing."

PERFECT MEMORY

"Available to you now * * * a perfect memory in your pocket," the brochure says. The machine also has various speeds and direction of the tape may be reversed.

The fake wristwatch control costs an added \$9.95. "Women students slip it into purse or handbag for handy use anywhere," the brochure says.

And the advertisement adds, "Because of the enthusiastic acceptance of PockeTutor by college students, teachers, coaches, professional and executive leaders across the country, demand occasionally exceeds our immediate supply * * * so order now and avoid any unnecessary delay."

Order blanks were enclosed with the brochures sent to the Northwestern students.

[From the Daily Northwestern, Feb. 24, 1965]
OPEN "TUTOR" PROBE: DAILY NORTHWESTERN
SPURS ACTION

(By Andrew H. Malcolm, assistant managing editor)

Federal, county, and city authorities in Seattle, Wash., began an intensive probe Tuesday into "PockeTutors."

The investigation followed a copyrighted story in the Daily Northwestern Tuesday.

The Federal authority, Virgil Worthington, assistant postal inspector in Seattle, said he would call the product's originator in for a conference today.

He is Darrell N. Markey, 27, who told the Daily Tuesday he "dreamed up the PockeTutor idea" a year ago.

The postal inspector said, "We want to take a close look at the operation. We'll have him up here with his entire sales program, brochures, the whole works Wednesday morning."

After hearing a description of the product and its accompanying brochure, Worthington said he wanted to investigate the possibility of mail fraud and false advertising.

BROCHURE STATEMENT

The brochure says, "Because of the enthusiastic acceptance of PockeTutor by college students, teachers, coaches, professional and executive leaders across the country, demand occasionally exceeds our immediate supply."

Markey admitted the product has not been manufactured "though we do have a prototype."

He said a Seattle company has agreed to build the pocket-sized visual prompters "if demand is great enough."

"It's too risky to go ahead and build some of these without having an idea of the potential response," he said.

"It also costs a good deal to send out these brochures. It runs about \$100 per thousand."

PockeTutor, which sells for \$19.95, is a small packet run by twin penlight batteries, which fits in a shirt pocket. A roll of paper inside (with equations, formulas, or anything on it) rolls past a transparent window on the top of the gadget.

It comes with a short wire pushbutton control or for another \$9.95 with a fake wristwatch which, when tilted, turns on the machine.

Although PockeTutor's advertising says nothing about cheating on examinations, the possibilities are obvious.

William A. Forant, chief investigator for the King County prosecutor's office, said he would be working closely with both U.S. Post Office investigators and the bunco squad of the Seattle City Police.

"I have talked with Worthington and the police on this," Forant said. "We're all investigating and should come up with something soon."

"I'll inform the county prosecutor, Charles O. Carroll, and he may plan some further action."

In the city Frank J. Zeorlin, general manager of the Seattle Better Business Bureau, said he had turned the entire case over to the police.

Zeorlin said the Better Business Bureau had checked its files Tuesday morning and found nothing on Markey or on Study Aid Products, the firm listed as the PockeTutor manufacturer.

"It's out of our hands now," he said, "but we'll be following it closely with the police."

Detective George O'Brien, chief of the city's bunco squad, opened a preliminary investigation within an hour after hearing of the Daily's story.

"This is right down our line here," he said.

Two hours later O'Brien and his squad had gathered a considerable amount of background information on the product's maker and his wife.

When told Markey admitted to the Daily that he was selling the machines, O'Brien said he would have his men contact Markey immediately.

"I imagine the postal boys will move in on this case, too," he said.

OTHER NEWSPAPERS JOIN IN

The Daily's investigation prompted four others. In Chicago the Tribune and Sun-Times both showed interest in similar stories.

In Seattle, both newspapers, the Times and Post-Intelligencer, were reported conducting their own probes of the case.

At Northwestern, 17 students have informed the Daily they received the PockeTutor brochures in the mail last week.

All the letters were postmarked Seattle and hand addressed. Order forms were included.

Markey said Tuesday he had mailed out 2,000 such brochures early last week—250 of them to Northwestern—as a "test mailing to sample student response."

Markey also said he sent brochures and order blanks to students at Tulane University, in New Orleans; the University of Kentucky, in Lexington; and Oregon State University, in Corvallis, Oreg.

MAKER SAYS "TUTOR" NOT FOR CHEATING

"It doesn't take a genius to realize PockeTutor could be used for cheating, but that wasn't the idea," Darrell N. Markey, the gadget's self-proclaimed inventor, said Tuesday.

Markey, 27, an insurance adjuster who lives at the Seattle address he gives for Study Aid Products, said, "We certainly don't want

to advocate cheating. We didn't have that in mind at all."

"I got the idea about a year ago that it would be handy to have such a thing, for instance, to study during coffee breaks at work if you're a student and work part time."

"Or you could study on the bus to school," he said. "We haven't even explored all the possibilities."

Markey, who said he graduated from the University of Washington in 1961, also said he has a partner in the company—Robert Nemyre, 50, a Seattle advertising man.

He said he has received no orders for PockeTutor yet, through some order blanks have been returned.

"We asked for comments from students," Markey said. "Most of the comments have been derogatory, intimating we had designed the machine solely for cheating on exams."

"I should think that would depend on the person's motivation," Markey said. "Cars are used for bank robberies too, but they aren't necessarily built for it."

Asked if the brochure's phrase "text items can be easily visible to you, even without others knowing" didn't intimate cheating, he said, "I suppose it could be taken both ways."

"Actually any student who uses PockeTutor for exam cheating is foolish. It's impractical because all the faculty members will know about it."

"If we do get enough orders, it would take about 3 weeks to get them out," he said.

"To break even just on our advertising we have to sell 10 PockeTutors for every 1,000 brochures we mail out."

"If we don't get enough orders, we'll return the money."

He said the fake wristwatch control, which costs an extra \$9.95, is "just an accessory, a little extra moneymaker."

"We found," he said, "we could get a good price on a large batch of these watches, so we tacked them on."

"You know we didn't mean to alarm anyone."

[From the Daily Northwestern, Feb. 25, 1965]
PockeTutor PROBE INTENSIFIED—TWO PROMOTERS CITED AS POSSIBLE STATUTE VIOLATORS

(By Andrew H. Malcolm, assistant managing editor)

Washington State officials are investigating today whether the Seattle PockeTutor firm is registered to do business in that State.

And a postal inspector in Seattle said he will take his information to the U.S. attorney there for possible Federal action.

Mail solicitation of orders for PockeTutors from Northwestern students was revealed Tuesday in a copyrighted story in the Daily Northwestern.

William A. Forant, chief investigator for the King County prosecutor's office, said Darrell N. Markey, the originator of PockeTutor, and his partner, Robert Nemyre, may be violating two State statutes: (1) Failure to register their business; (2) false advertising.

"I have verbal confirmation from the State tax commissioner that Markey has not registered his business," Forant said. "We're waiting for the commissioner's written statement to get here from the capital."

A 1935 Washington State statute requires all businesses in the State to register their firms and purchase a \$1.25 license.

GROSS MISDEMEANOR

Failure to do so is a gross misdemeanor and is punishable upon conviction by 1 year in prison or a \$1,000 fine or both.

Forant also said King County may prosecute the pair for false advertising on their brochure.

At two separate places on the pamphlet the firm, Study Aid Products, intimates an "enthusiastic acceptance of PockeTutor *** across the country," and that an order upon

receipt of \$19.95 the device "will be forwarded prepaid at once."

Markey told the Daily, Tuesday, that once he received "enough orders" it would take at least 3 weeks to produce any. "All we have is a prototype," he said.

CONTRACT WITH FIRM

At the conference Markey said they had contracted with a Seattle plastics firm to build PockeTutors. Detective George O'Brien of the city's bunco squad told the Daily, Wednesday, he hoped to meet late Wednesday night or early this morning with the company's owner.

"We want to see if a contract was really made," he said.

O'Brien also said Markey told him they had mailed 4,000 brochures to students at Southern Methodist University, North Texas State, and Stanford University.

Markey told the Daily, Tuesday, he mailed 2,000 brochures to students at Northwestern University, Tulane, the University of Kentucky, and Oregon State University.

Virgil Worthington, assistant postal inspector in Seattle, said Wednesday he was going to present evidence gathered by both Seattle police and his own investigation to William Goodwin, the U.S. attorney in Seattle.

"If we prosecute, it would be for using the mails for false advertising," Worthington said. "And that's a Federal law."

Worthington also suggested possible prosecution if the firm failed to produce PockeTutor for those who purchased them and the postal inspector received any formal complaints.

[From the Daily Northwestern, Feb. 26, 1965]

THE PROBE

Tuesday this newspaper exposed the attempt of a Seattle firm that calls itself Study Aid Products to peddle its PockeTutor to Northwestern students through the mails.

Throughout the week the Daily Northwestern has followed up on the progress of a Federal, State, and local investigation of the product.

Why has this newspaper which concentrates on campus news devoted so much space this week to a story occurring 2,000 miles from the shores of Lake Michigan?

The answer is simple. The investigation of the PockeTutors is relevant to the Northwestern campus. It's relevant because Northwestern was one of a few selected campuses on which Darrell N. Markey has tried to sell his gadget.

But most importantly, the PockeTutor story is relevant to a campus community because the device appeals so blatantly to academic dishonesty. And academic dishonesty is an important question on this or any other campus. The fact that a story on that problem gains national prominence does not alter its relevance to a campus community.

Had Markey been permitted to penetrate this and other campuses with his study-aid device, undoubtedly the PockeTutors would have popped up during examinations. Then the story would have been different.

TO PRODUCE PockeTUTOR: BUILDER REVEALS HE NEEDS 3 WEEKS

(By Andrew H. Malcolm, assistant managing editor)

The Seattle manufacturer of PockeTutor has revealed to police that it would take 23 to 30 days to put the device into production, the Daily Northwestern learned Thursday.

Detective George O'Brien, of the Seattle Bunco Squad, said the manufacturer, James W. Hawley, president of the Hawley Training Devices Inc., admitted that in a written statement to police.

Darrell N. Markey, originator of PockeTutor, has advertised immediate delivery on the brochures he sent to college students across the country.

"Because of the enthusiastic acceptance of PockeTutor * * * demand occasionally exceeds our immediate supply" the pamphlet says.

And, it adds, when an order is received, "Your PockeTutor will be forwarded prepaid at once."

The Daily Northwestern revealed the mail solicitation of college students in a copy-righted story Tuesday.

O'Brien said Thursday he had turned his entire investigation file over to William A. Forant, chief inspector for the King County prosecutor.

Forant said actual production of PockeTutors "is definitely not a crime." But he added the State was investigating whether the PockeTutor brochure might fall under the State's false advertising statute.

"We have not yet received written confirmation that Markey has not registered his business with the tax commissioner," Forant said. He said he had already received oral confirmation.

Hawley, the manufacturer, said Thursday, running a PockeTutor could be heard "in quiet surroundings."

"To anticipate your question," he said, the noise of PockeTutor would be evident in quiet surroundings like those in an examination. It would sound like a small fan or one of those quieter electric shavers on the market now."

He said Markey and his partner, Robert Nemyre, debated over putting a handle on the mechanism to prop it up for a speaker.

"We just decided against the handle because it was just another part, would cost more, and a person could just as easily prop it up on anything handy," Hawley said.

Hawley, who said his firm does some subcontract work for Boeing Aircraft, also revealed PockeTutor does not operate at different speeds, as intimated in the advertising.

The pamphlet says, "Material * * * can be viewed by skipping back and forth as frequently as you choose and at any desired speed."

He said Markey would have to invest about another \$700 for molds and materials before production could actually start. "He already has a considerable amount (police said \$650) invested in this thing. We worked 7 months developing the prototype," Hawley said.

"I know this cheating never occurred to Markey," he added.

THE ELDERCARE BILL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as we in the Congress approach the time of decision on so-called medicare-type legislation, I think we must recognize that, by the time such legislation becomes effective, we will be dealing with the needs of almost 20 million citizens over age 65.

In recent days, some labor leaders, including Walter Reuther, have charged that the eldercare bill, which I and others are sponsoring, is too costly.

The time has come to set the record straight. Proponents of H.R. 1 and S. 1 admit that the administration-backed bill will cost \$3.788 billion annually. This does not take into consideration the well-known "abuse factor," characteristically greater in Federal programs.

I submit that the eldercare bill will not and, in fact, could not cost more than \$847 million annually, and a portion of this amount would be paid for by the States. Let me illustrate the validity of this comparison.

As you know, under the eldercare bill, there are three categories of people set up as determined by their own statements of income. Federal-State funds would be used to pay all insurance premiums for those in the lowest category, and approximately half the cost of the premium for those in the second category.

Testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee reveals that approximately 20 percent of the aged would require full Federal-State payment of their health insurance premium.

Twenty percent of 20 million people is 4 million, multiplied by \$250 annual insurance premium equals \$1 billion annually. The \$250 figure was used by the Ways and Means Committee chairman to describe the cost of good and adequate insurance protection for the aged equal to the benefits available to Government employees under their present program.

Then, to this we must add possibly another 30 percent of the aging, or 6 million persons who would qualify for approximately one-half—\$125—of their premium being paid by Federal-State funds; 6 million times \$125 equals \$750 million annually. Thus, the total cost of this bill would be \$1,750,000 annually, from which must be subtracted the \$803 million spent on Kerr-Mills—OAA and MAA—the last fiscal year, giving us a net cost of \$847 million annually.

This, then, is the figure to compare with the \$3.788 billion figure of the administration, with its much lesser Kerr-Mills deductions which would have to be maintained to supply the other 75 percent of the unmet needs of this group.

And, let us not forget that, under eldercare, we would have good and adequate protection equal to that currently afforded Federal employees, as opposed to the very minimal benefits—25 percent—offered under the administration bill.

An honest portrayal of this comparison will show that "eldercare makes medicare look sick."

As a basis for further comparison, the administration proposes to spend \$3.26 billion this fiscal year on foreign aid. Is one-fourth of this amount too much to allocate for a sound medical program for the aged?

REAPPORTIONMENT DECISION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues of the House, my purpose in arranging this special order is to cast some light on the intentions of those who have introduced constitutional amendments on the subject of State legislative reapportionment and to clarify the issues presented by the efforts of those of us who are working to bring this matter before the House for final disposition under the rules of the House.

Let me say at the outset that there is no question as to whether this Congress will make a final decision on the issue. It is merely a question of when and by what means. The House will reach a final vote on the matter either by discharge petition, which has been filed by Congressman PATMAN, by a rule from the Committee on Rules, or by a measure reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary. This will happen because a majority of the House are in favor of some form of constitutional amendment being presented to the legislatures of the 50 States for ratification. We do have a majority. Whether we have a two-thirds majority required for the passage of a constitutional amendment is another question. Because time is of the essence, Mr. Speaker, as several States are already under court order to reapportion, including my own State of Missouri, I have signed the discharge petition filed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. To date 67 Members have signed the petition, which is an unusual number, taking into consideration the very short time that the petition has been on file.

May I say that the issue that will be presented ultimately by the discharge petition and the amendment which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has agreed to accept, will not be a question of whether or not the Supreme Court has improperly invaded an area reserved to the States under the Constitution or whether or not the Court reached the right decision. The issue will not concern the case of Baker against Carr, the Tennessee reapportionment case, or Reynolds against Simms, or the New York or Virginia cases. The issue presented will deal with the Colorado case alone. The issue will be solely, one, as to whether or not American citizens are to be given the right to decide through the ballot box that one house of their State legislature may be constituted on the basis of factors other than population if a majority of the citizens of those States so desire.

Now, let us examine the so-called reapportionment cases and the reasons why I think it is so important that the House decide this issue at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court, on June 15 of 1964, I submit, finished its work of completely devastating one of the most basic and one of the most revered concepts of American constitutional government. The framers of the Constitution took care to define the duties of each of our three branches of Government with the purpose of guaranteeing that each should have final authority in its particular field and have no authority to interfere with the affairs of any other branch. Thus, every American schoolchild has been proudly told that the legislative makes the laws, the judiciary interprets them, and the executive enforces them. Because of this separation of powers concept, each branch of our Federal Government has historically taken great care to refrain from crossing the constitutional boundaries of its own authority. Adhering to this important distinction between jurisdictional

boundaries, the Supreme Court early determined that it could not hear cases which were essentially political in nature. Such questions were, in the Court's opinion, matters for the consideration of the legislature and not cognizable by the Court or, as the Court said, they were not justiciable.

From the beginning of this Nation until March of 1962 it was generally conceded in case after case that each State was responsible for setting up and maintaining its own plan for the election of State representatives and State senators. However, in *Baker against Carr*, decided March 26, 1962, the Supreme Court ruled that the citizens of Tennessee were entitled to have their complaint against the State legislative apportionment plan adjudicated. Thus, the Court entered into the political arena and has, without doubt, assumed a legislative role.

I am not here, Mr. Speaker, to defend the rampant abuse of legislative apportionment which exists throughout the breadth of this great land. I am here, however, to argue that the Supreme Court is no place for reform as argued by Justice Harlan in his dissenting opinion in the *Alabama* case. I am here to argue that the end does not justify the means. I am here to say that the Supreme Court has not properly interpreted the Constitution but rather has amended it by judicial decree. I am here to point out the dangers of those decisions.

I am not here to castigate the Supreme Court although the Court, by intruding into the political field, into the legislative field, has opened itself to valid political criticism. As President Truman said, "If you can't stand the heat get out of the kitchen." The Supreme Court has entered into the political kitchen. The Supreme Court is now legislating irrespective of whether that legislation is good or bad. In doing so it has converted a political philosophy into a constitutional rule and has applied the so-called "one-man, one-vote" principle so arbitrarily that it does great damage to the genius of the Federal system.

Mr. Speaker, the late Justice Frankfurter, one of the greatest judicial liberals of this century, sounded the alarm in *Baker against Carr* when he pointed out the following in his dissenting opinion:

The Court today reverses a uniform course of decisions established by a dozen cases, including one by which the very claim now sustained was unanimously rejected only 5 years ago. The impressive body of rulings thus cast aside reflected the equally uniform course of our political history regarding the relationship between population. Such a massive repudiation of the experience of our past in asserting destructively novel judicial power demands a detailed analysis of the role of this Court in our constitutional scheme. Disregard of inherent limits in the effective exercise of the Court's "judicial power" not only presages the futility of judicial intervention in the essentially political conflict of forces by which the relation between population and representation has time out of mind been and is now determined. It may well impair the Court's position as the ultimate organ of the supreme law of the land.

The last thought of Justice Frankfurter in the foregoing quote is the one that concerns me.

There is great danger in these cases which could spell disaster ahead in our judicial system.

Mr. Speaker, Justice Harlan said in his dissenting opinion in June 1964 that:

The majority has cut deeply into the fabric of our Federal system and that these decisions have the effect of placing the basic aspects of State political systems under the persuasive overlordship of the Federal judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, Justice Stewart in his dissenting opinion in the *Colorado* case said this:

The Court's Draconian pronouncement makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States and finds no support in the words of the Constitution in any prior decisions of this Court or in the 176-year political history of the Federal Union.

Mr. Speaker, I have some of the same fears voiced by Justices Frankfurter, Stewart, and Harlan. Justice Stewart, in effect, observed that to ascertain the meaning of the Constitution you no longer look to the Constitution itself but into the changing channels of the complex minds of the members of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, this is a real issue, and in this respect I have been deeply concerned about the tendency of Americans, including many prominent political figures, to put this issue on the basis of rural interests versus urban interests. If they are associated with rural America they are opposed to legislative reapportionment. If they are from urban America, they stand to gain in legislative seats and, so, are in favor of the Supreme Court's decisions.

Mr. Speaker, let us take for example this excerpt from a speech made by a very prominent former Governor of the State of California:

Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting their representation to the State senate to a strictly population basis. It is for the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union, equal representation in one House and proportionate representation in the other. Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation in our State even though it has served us well and is strictly in accord with the American tradition and the pattern of our National Government. Our State has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative representation. I believe we should keep it.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor that was speaking of California in that speech in 1948 was none other than the now Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. This, ladies and gentlemen of the House, points out an attribute of the decisions which to me is absolutely terrifying. Shall we have a government of men or shall we have a government of law? Who will we have on the Supreme Court tomorrow, or next year, or the next decade? Will we have a Mr. Earl Warren as Governor of the State of California or will we have a Mr. Earl Warren,

the Chief Justice of the United States, the writer of the opinion in the case of *Reynolds against Simms*.

Mr. Speaker, this portrays to me the danger of the Supreme Court amending the Constitution by judicial decree. This emphasizes the need for law and precedent if we are to maintain a stable republic. The minds of men change. The Constitution should not be changed until it has been changed by the American people from whom all governmental power is derived.

Mr. Speaker, I have read innumerable papers supporting the position of the Supreme Court, but I have yet to find anyone citing any precedent that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment means that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population.

Is there anyone in this body who will seriously maintain that when the Congress of the United States debated the 14th amendment it intended it to apply to State legislative apportionment? Was the matter even referred to when the 14th amendment was debated? Was the matter even remotely discussed in any of the State legislatures when they ratified the 14th amendment?

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLODY. First of all I want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri on the most eloquent and learned statement that he made here today in the House of Representatives, also because of the timeliness of the statement. I am not confident of the figures, but I do know that most of the State legislatures of the Nation are meeting in session this year, and that the opportunity for having such a proposed constitutional amendment ratified exists now provided the House of Representatives acts now.

In my own case, I have signed the discharge petition, at the Speaker's desk. This is the first discharge petition I have ever signed, and is a departure from a rule I made for myself with regard to the signing of discharge petitions. However, I cannot help but be impressed by the importance and by the immediacy of the situation. I know in my experience as a former member of the State Legislature of Illinois I had the experience of recommending an amendment to the Illinois constitution to provide exactly what the constitutional amendment proposed here would authorize, namely, the establishment in Illinois of one House of the Illinois General Assembly based upon population alone, that is, the House of Representatives of the Illinois General Assembly, and that the State Senate of Illinois take into consideration subjects other than population.

The proposition in Illinois was submitted to the voters at the 1954 general election and overwhelmingly approved by the voters of the urban and rural areas alike as a fair and reasonable solution to the problem of legislative representation in the State of Illinois.

This is the type of constitutional provision which would be permitted in the 50 States of the Nation if the constitu-

tional amendment which we are proposing and recommending, and which is referred to in the discharge petition, is adopted.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I might say that the discharge petition has been filed on the constitutional amendment which has been introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. His constitutional amendment merely provides that nothing in the Constitution shall prohibit a State from having a bicameral legislature, from having one house based on factors other than population. However, we propose to introduce an amendment and vote for an amendment which will require that the legislative scheme of apportionment be approved by a majority of the people in the State.

Mr. McCLORY. In addition to ratification by the State legislative body or the State convention, whichever is employed?

Mr. ICHORD. That is right.

Mr. McCLORY. I certainly want to congratulate the gentleman on the very fine and important statement he is making here in the House of Representatives today, and to pledge my support.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to move away from the law and precedents and consider the decisions solely on a moral basis. Assume that there is no Constitution, and that the supreme law flows only from the political philosophy of the members of the Supreme Court. Let us get away from the Federal analogy and the obvious intent of the founders of the Constitution to permit area representation as well as population representation, and consider only the situation existing in the various States.

I personally cannot defend the malapportionment on a moral basis which existed in Alabama, and I might say several other States. First we must take cognizance of the fact that America has changed. We are no longer a rural Nation, we are now an urban Nation, and becoming increasingly urban with the passing of each day. Rural legislators in many cases have unjustly failed to give urban areas proper representation, not only by making it difficult for a majority of the people to reapportion, but also by simply ignoring their State constitution and declining to reapportion legislative districts so as to follow population shifts.

Considering the widespread existence of malapportionment, we must conclude that reform was needed, and this is the reason why the Supreme Court has been able to amend the Constitution by judicial decree, and with the support of so many people. It is regrettable that reform had to come about in this manner. History has shown the danger of reform taken in such manner.

During the French Revolution, for example, the revolutionaries were impatient with the revolutionary processes and acted through bodies that were less and less representative. You will remember that the French revolutionaries moved from the National Assembly to the Legislative Assembly, then to the

Paris Commune, then to the Committee of Public Safety, then to the Directorate, and then to Napoleon.

Mr. Speaker, I can only quarrel with the means in the New York, Virginia, Maryland, and Alabama cases. I cannot quarrel with the end. But in the Colorado case the Supreme Court refuted its own one-man, one-vote principle. In that case the people of Colorado had spoken. All of the people of Colorado had spoken, applying the one-man, one-vote principle. They had chosen overwhelmingly to have a bicameral legislature with one house based upon population and the other house based on geography and other factors. This is the aspect of the decision that has appalled me.

My home State of Missouri has a bicameral legislature with the upper house based on population and the lower house based on a combination of geography and population.

The people of Missouri have approved this system time and time again. I cannot accept the preposterous principle that when the legislatures of three-fourths of the States of this Nation adopted the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment that they surrendered their right to have such a bicameral legislature.

Again I ask that anyone come forth with evidence that it was intended by the Congress and by the legislatures that ratified the 14th amendment that this result was intended. If not, have we changed our rules of constitutional construction? This, however, is what the Colorado case held. It said to the people of Missouri and to the people of Colorado and to the people of all of the 50 States that it makes no difference what kind of State legislature you might want to have, even if you want the system that you have had since the birth of the Republic, even if you vote statewide using the one-man, one-vote principle and decide 3 to 1 to keep your system, you are still prohibited from having it. The equal protection clause of the 14th amendment forbids you to experiment.

The Chief Justice of the United States supported by a majority of the Justices has changed his mind—you have been wrong for 177 years.

Thus our proposal, I submit, is moderate indeed. We merely want to give the majority of the people of every State voting statewide the right to decide whether or not they shall have the same system that prevails in the Federal legislature.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for bringing this to the attention of the House, and also to acquaint the Members of the House with this gentleman's vast knowledge in this great area that we are discussing today. He is a former speaker of the Missouri Legislature and most certainly is very capable, learned, and qualified to present this important subject to the House of Representatives.

I want also to commend the gentleman for making it very clear that this is not a rural versus urban matter or an urban versus rural matter. This is a fight for those people who believe in the principle of a bicameral system of the legislature. The fact of the matter is that you have three branches instead of two. You have the house of representatives and a senate, one of the houses based on the factor of population and the other body on other factors. Then you have a Governor of a State who is also elected by a majority of the people who does participate in the legislative process whether it be by the veto power of legislation or by the threat of a veto. So we do have in effect three houses of our legislature and the principle of the bicameral legislature is to take into consideration other factors than just the population factor. We do have economic factors and other matters of affinity which affect the contiguousness of areas—germaneness and other things that they have in common that can be and very vividly should be considered in matters of legislative apportionment.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I do not think any of us condone malapportioned legislatures. Even though we cannot say that it has always been true that we have had ideally apportioned legislatures. If they have an opportunity to work as they work on every other problem, they can resolve these very critical problems. I am certainly not a part of the effort to try to say we have rural domination or urban domination. I think there is a balance that leads to good government.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for his very penetrating observations and thank him also for his kind remarks.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. I should like to join my colleague from Missouri in his remarks this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important items of unfinished business left by the previous 88th Congress was that involving the reapportionment of State legislatures. This legislation was extensively debated last year, and the fact that it was not approved before adjournment in no way lessens the urgency of the problem.

On the opening day of the 89th Congress, January 4, 1965, I reintroduced my bill on this subject, House Joint Resolution 18, which would provide for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population. A number of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Senate have introduced similar resolutions. In view of the widespread feeling throughout the Nation that an immediate solution to this controversy is essential, it is my opinion that the Congress is duty

bound to forthrightly face this issue and promptly consider this legislation.

This is the time of year when State legislatures are convening throughout the country, and they are naturally anxious to know what action the Congress will take. In my own State of Illinois, our State legislature is now in session and meets only every 2 years; and the convening of a special session involves considerable expense. Yet, the Committee on the Judiciary has to date not scheduled hearings on reapportionment bills.

Many people in my congressional district have either visited with me or written to me about their concern regarding reapportionment. They are rightfully disturbed over last year's decision by the Supreme Court which, in interpreting the 14th amendment, requires the States to reapportion their legislatures so that every member of each house represents substantially the same number of people in his constituency. The public confusion following this decision is readily understandable, for a majority of the States have patterned their legislatures after the principle embodied in our Federal Constitution with regard to the Congress—that one body was to represent each geographic unit and the other the population distribution of the Nation. This is the basis for our traditional American concept of a fair and reasonable plan of bicameralism in a representative government, and the analogy of this Federal system to the present problem involving the States cannot be ignored.

Despite the fact that the Supreme Court has now struck down this system promulgated by the Constitution itself, I believe that the same reasoning which prompted our Founding Fathers to avoid apportioning both Houses of Congress on the basis of population is still applicable to legislative apportionment in the States today. In my opinion, the Supreme Court has exceeded its constitutional authority in this ruling. The power to amend the Constitution rests with the people, and I believe the Congress should give them the opportunity to decide this issue. Therefore, the Congress should consider this legislation without delay.

Mr. ICHORD. I might say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that I know there have been at least 80 constitutional amendments introduced thus far in the House of Representatives.

I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for her observations and I believe she has made a very important point concerning the Court amending the Constitution. That is my position. I do not believe there is any doubt about that fact. Really, there has never been much of an argument about it. The Supreme Court has amended the Constitution by judicial decree. Amendments should be accomplished through the procedures established in the Constitution itself.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I thank the gentleman. I rise to commend the gentleman from Missouri for bringing this matter

to the attention of the House today. I also wish to show my appreciation for his remarks and the remarks of others, who have pointed out the fact that this is not an urban versus rural controversy. It involves a basic, constitutional precept.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to come from and represent the most urbanized district in the State of North Carolina. It is about 70 percent urban and 30 percent rural. I view as one of the most important matters pending before this Congress the need to take some action to correct the most unfortunate decision which was handed down by the Supreme Court on June 15 of last year.

Again I commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I believe his presentation has been most timely, most appropriate, and most urgent.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his contribution, particularly since he represents an urban district. He is one Member of the House who is not deciding this issue based upon his urban residence but is looking at the constitutional questions involved.

Mr. KORNEGAY. That is exactly correct. I appreciate very much the gentleman's making that statement.

I might add to the fact that I come from an urban district that my State of North Carolina is not "in the soup" so to speak at the moment. In my opinion, its legislative makeup is patently unconstitutional under the one-man, one-vote rule.

While my State, as many others, probably has not abided by the constitutional provision for periodic reapportionment as it should, this still is no way to get at that problem. The medicine is worse than the disease. From my observation, nothing but trouble and chaos have been created throughout much of this country subsequent to and as a result of the unfortunate decision which I just referred to.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] and my other colleagues this afternoon who have expressed their interest in this terrific problem of legislative reapportionment and their earnest desire to try to solve this matter by means of constitutional procedures. As my colleagues have pointed out, this is not a matter of country versus city. I believe the gentleman from Missouri will agree with me when I would add that it is not a matter of a liberal philosophy versus a conservative philosophy.

Mr. ICHORD. I would point out to the distinguished gentleman from Florida that the gentleman who wrote the dissenting opinion in Baker against Carr, the late Justice Frankfurter, was known as one of the greatest liberals of this century in the judiciary.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for that comment, and I certainly agree with him.

So the matter resolves itself down to this proposition; namely, whether or not we are going to try to solve through constitutional procedures this grave problem which to me is actually the biggest domestic problem confronting America today.

Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with permitting the people of a State, if they so decide by a vote, to say that they want one house of their legislature apportioned on a basis other than population? That is the issue and the question. It is a clear-cut question. I join with many of my colleagues in presenting a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to give our people of the 50 States that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri once again and pledge to him my cooperation and pledge to my colleagues who have introduced several bills my efforts with them to correct this terrible problem in the very immediate future.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the learned gentleman from Florida for his valuable comments, and I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman for his remarks this afternoon and to associate myself with those remarks. I think the gentleman has made a powerful argument in favor of congressional action enacting these resolutions, one of which I happen to have introduced myself. I was interested in the gentleman's reading of the speech made by the present Chief Justice when he was Governor of California.

Mr. ICHORD. This was a speech made by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court when he was Governor of the State of California.

Mr. BETTS. I am aware of that speech. Therein I think lies one of the biggest arguments in favor of congressional action in that the Supreme Court, while it followed the principle of one-man, one-vote, actually abandoned another historical constitutional concept, namely, the concept of checks and balances, which has provided for and established the National Congress and which we thought was constitutionally established in all of the States and their legislatures. To me this is one of the big arguments in favor of this congressional action, that is, restoring this historic concept of checks and balances.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. He made some very interesting and enlightening points.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman for yielding and observe that I signed the discharge petition, and I feel very strongly, just as the gentleman expressed himself here today. It seems to me this would raise the question, if we do not overturn this Supreme Court decision by legislative act and by constitutional amendment I wonder if the gentleman would

agree with me that we might just as well have all of our State legislatures unicameral in nature rather than bicameral.

Mr. ICHORD. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Illinois. You can even go further and say that you might as well be consistent and well reapportion the Senate of the United States and have their membership based upon population rather than geography. It may very well be that the Supreme Court will make a logical extension of its reasoning and say that since the equal protection clause is in the 14th amendment, which came after article I establishing the Senate of the United States, that article I has now been overruled by the equal protection clause, and that body should be reapportioned.

Mr. MICHEL. I think the gentleman makes a very good point.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the other descriptions I have given of the gentleman's remarks today I want to add that it is a most studious presentation which he has made and one that should be helpful as a bit of reference material for the House of Representatives as we approach this problem of State legislative reapportionment.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add that I concur wholeheartedly, too, in the point that the States which have already established by constitutional amendment legislative reapportionment, as has been done in Missouri and in Illinois, have observed the one-man, one-vote principle. I think it is an important point which the gentleman has made and I want to add that that principle was observed in Illinois in the adoption of the constitutional amendment in 1954.

Mr. Speaker, may I add this further point, that as far as admonishing the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States to act promptly on this matter, we constantly hear the argument that the legislative branch of the Federal Government is having its powers diminished and that the executive and judicial branches are growing in strength and power at the expense of the legislative branch. Here is a good opportunity, it seems to me, for the Congress of the United States to reassert its constitutional authority and at least to present to the people of the Nation the opportunity to vote on this important proposition.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has made a very important point. We are one of the vehicles through which the Constitution of the United States may be amended.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield again to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have noted that the gentleman made reference to the fact that the next step could well be reapportionment of the U.S. Senate. I would like to ask the gentleman his views on this particular proposition. Would it not likewise be a

part of this one-man one-vote principle that it should apply to local boards, such as boards of county commissioners, school boards, and other local boards that political subdivisions may have according to the various political setups in the States?

Mr. ICHORD. It is my information that a court in Wisconsin—I do not know whether it was a State court or a Federal district court—has held that the principle is applicable to school districts and other minor governmental subdivisions.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Does the gentleman have any feeling or any opinion about the kind of situation that would create locally? Many of the boards of county commissioners or school boards or other local boards may wake up one morning and find that they were unconstitutional.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman that if they were unconstitutional perhaps the bonds which they had submitted to the people of the various subdivisions would also be illegal and void and great repercussions could flow from such a holding.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding. The gentleman referred to the Wisconsin Supreme Court decision. We have already awakened one morning and found that our county commissioners and boards and school districts were as the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. ICHORD. That was a Wisconsin Supreme Court decision?

Mr. LAIRD. The Wisconsin Supreme Court, which is the highest court in Wisconsin, and it has already ruled on that particular question.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to make one additional statement: Then not only are we tampering with the political setup—and I use that expression in broad context—of our Federal Government, but also it could result in difficulty arising in the financial obligations that had heretofore been made by the local boards and local governing bodies.

Mr. ICHORD. I believe the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. KORNEGAY. The point of the matter is and the point which I am trying to bring out, Mr. Speaker, is that there is just no end to this chain reaction and that it breeds chaos upon chaos. In other words, the farther down the line you go the worse it gets.

I thank again the gentleman for yielding to me and I compliment him most highly for his fine presentation.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his very learned contribution.

LEGISLATION DESIGNED TO EXPAND FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION PROJECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). Under previous order of the

House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today is a very appropriate day for me to speak on behalf of the bill I have introduced to expand fish and wildlife restoration projects by providing for a study of a comprehensive, long-range program to reclaim and rehabilitate surface mining areas in the United States.

Strip mining of coal has been going on in my home State of Illinois for many years. As a matter of fact, it began in 1866 in the Danville, Ill., area, a fine part of central Illinois. In Illinois we have had some experience with restoration efforts in the strip mining areas.

In 1963, the most recent year for which adequate statistics are available, Illinois was the leading State in the United States in the production of coal by strip mining.

Of 458,928,000 tons of coal mined in the United States from all types of mines in that year, about one-third or 144,141,000 tons were from strip mines. Of a total 51,736,000 tons mined in Illinois, strip mines accounted for 27,287,000 tons or nearly 53 percent of the total.

Strip-mining operations in Illinois are generally very modern, large-scale operations. Average production in 1963 per man per day was 33.7 tons. There were 64 such operations in the State as compared with 116 in Kentucky, 266 in Ohio, 521 in Pennsylvania, 130 in West Virginia, and 38 in Indiana. All of those States, as I reported earlier, produced less coal by strip mining than did Illinois; Indiana produced only 10,939,000 tons.

Such operations unavoidably disturbed the surface and overburden on large acreages. As one writer has put it, a completed strip mine operation leaves the earth as if furrowed by a large plow which has turned the earth upside down to a depth of 10 to 70 feet; and so it does. I have five such operations in my Peoria County. The landscape is indeed modified as the great behemoths plow their way across our Corn Belt fields.

It is estimated that more than 750,000 acres have been disturbed in the United States since the first coal strip mine was instituted in 1866. This is increasing at the rate of perhaps 25,000 acres per year.

As you might expect people did experiment to see what use could be made with such wasteland. The first recorded project of reclamation of surface-mined land occurred in Indiana in 1918. This experiment was followed closely by a venture in Illinois in 1920, when 6 acres of mined land was planted with 9,000 pine and hardwood trees.

Not unnaturally, legislation was sought at an early date to regulate strip-mining operations and to provide for assurance of performance which would, to a degree, restore or rehabilitate the usefulness of the disturbed surface.

Of major strip-mining States, West Virginia, in 1939, was the first to enact legislation regulating such operations. Indiana followed in 1941, Illinois in 1943. However, the original Illinois statute was declared unconstitutional by the Illinois Supreme Court on the basis that it did not appear to have a reasonable relation to public health, inasmuch as backfilling was not required for the final cut, and discriminated against coal strip-mine operators. The 1961 act is broader and includes all stripping operations, whatever the mineral, if the overburden exceeds a depth of 10 feet.

I am not today holding the Illinois statute up as a model—it has in fact been criticized with respect to several aspects of its reclamation features, the possibility of substituting other land previously mined but not reclaimed, and for the reason that a penalty can be imposed only for failure to secure a permit before engaging in operations.

But in enacting legislation which I favor, which among other things will provide for a study of a comprehensive, long-range program for the purpose of reclaiming and rehabilitating strip and surface mining areas of the United States, we ought to take account of the fact that a good amount of information is known to be available in Washington and in some of the important strip-mining States.

For example, Arnold E. Lamm reported to the Conference of Surface Mining, at Roanoke, Va., in April 1964:

In Indiana the total area affected by strip mining in the State since mining began until June 30, 1963, amounted to 80,066 acres. Of this, 67,193 acres have been reclaimed. A total of 44,809,700 trees have been planted, 5,434 acres of land have been seeded ungraded, and 1,343 acres have been graded and seeded. In addition to the above, 9,220 acres have been converted into lakes and 4,139 acres have been provided to the State for forest preserves. An additional 7,853 acres have been converted into other recreation areas, including sportsmen's clubs, State parks, hunting and fishing areas and private clubs. In addition to this impressive development, 2,880 acres have been converted into private homesites and only 3,653 acres remain unreclaimed.

Illinois coal operators, with the exception of a few companies, began major land-use ventures in 1938 (some work was started 40 years ago), even before the industry in Illinois was of importance. Since that time, approximately 60 percent of the strip-mined area has been put into active uses—almost all on a voluntary basis, since the so-called strip mine law did not take effect until January 1, 1962. Significantly, the operators own only about 62 percent of the acreage mined, with the remainder in private (28 percent) and public (10 percent) holdings. Most of that in private ownership was mined on a royalty basis whereby the landowner sold coal only and retained the surface after mining. The strip-mining industry has done an excellent job in revegetating mined lands. Illinois operators can, without hesitation, point to their record of achievement on 115,000 acres as a model for others.

Unfortunately, too few persons are acquainted with what has been done in Illinois by the strip mine operators. How many realize that:

1. Some 17,000 acres of mined areas have been reforested with over 17 million trees.
2. Approximately 23,000 acres are being used for pasture to graze some 10,000 head of cattle, hogs, and sheep.

3. Almost 9,000 acres have been developed as recreational areas—including a State park, many private clubs, sportsmen's clubs, and the Southern Illinois University research area.

4. Lakes and ponds in excess of 2 acres each have been formed by mining operations on some 6,500 acres. These are generally heavily fished with many companies allowing use through a permit system.

5. Row crops (hay, corn, and so forth) are grown on approximately 3,000 acres.

6. Commercial orchards have been planted on some 135 acres of mined lands.

7. Over 8,000 acres are presently in some stage of development for one or more of the uses listed above.

It does appear to me that a lot of the necessary information is already available, and only requires collation. The Secretary of the Interior did testify on much the same study proposed in 1964 by S. 1013 that a difficult but important aspect of the study would be the determination of size, location, ownership, and effect of past operations at abandoned strip mines. Perhaps so. However, insofar as surveys are necessary, we should recognize that most, if not all, of these areas have been photographed from the air. These shots probably are available in county offices, if not in Washington. And most of the county offices now employ people who have had experience in checking acreages involved in agricultural program compliance by instrumental measurements made on such photos.

In view of these several facts and circumstances, there would seem to me no good reason why the final report, with recommendations, should not and could not be delivered to the Congress in 1 year—by July 1, 1966.

If private lands are to remain outside the official rehabilitation program pending the completion of the study, that is all the more reason for pursuing it diligently to conclusions and recommendations in 1 year.

I am not unaware that other acreage, amounting in total to perhaps 625,000 acres, has been surface mined for materials other than coal, notably gold, iron ore, and phosphate rock. This makes the problem somewhat larger, but not too large for completion in a year in my opinion.

REPUBLICAN OPPORTUNITY AND RESPONSIBILITY IN 89TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States exists to serve the citizens of the United States—not the executive branch of the U.S. Government. This body is a full partner in the process of government, not a poor relation.

And I speak today in solemn pledge that my party, minority though it may

be, has not forgotten these things and will not permit the Nation to forget them.

Some who speak for the Executive may call this obstructionism, obstinacy, or negativism. I call it a positive and constructive contribution to a republic whose chief design is the liberty of its people and not the exaltation of its leaders.

I do not say that Congress should, or Republicans should automatically oppose every request of the Executive. I do say that Congress should, and I pledge you that every Republican will, carefully weigh every such request.

We have heard the Chief Executive speak to the Congress and tell us of his plans and programs for the Nation. We know that many of his party in the Congress will support all of these as a matter of course. We know that the sheer mathematics of political reality means that most will pass.

We also know, however, that there is danger that it will be only mathematics, and not political morality, that will guide many of these passages.

It is because of that danger and its high probability that the role of the minority party in the 89th Congress cannot be overstated.

THE ROLE OF THE MINORITY

We are not chained to the proposals of the executive. And, because we are free, we represent also the freedom of any Member of this body—on either side of the aisle—to speak out for his convictions, and the good of his constituents against the awesome power of the executive machine.

We are a minority, painfully so. But we are also one of the two major parties of this Nation and, numbers aside, those who forget this or minimize this do our entire political tradition and our future in freedom a grave disservice.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that there is no Member of this House who would rise to defend a one-party system in this Nation. And I trust that there is no Member who will listen to me and fail to see the implications, for our two-party system, of the minority party's role today.

That role has never been more important.

Nor has it ever been more important for the majority party to understand clearly that when the minority speaks—as I promise you, Mr. Speaker, it will speak—it does so to jog the conscience, not just the partisan calculations, of the majority.

The Republican Party and the men by whom it is represented in this House remains a party committed to principles which set it apart from the administration now in power in this country. I refer to our difference with the administration most deliberately, for I am as aware as any man that these very same principles are shared in full measure by some Members of the majority party in this House.

The Republican Party is not speaking just for Republicans who want to hear alternatives to this administration's proposals. It is speaking for all who reject the Federal extremism of the administration, for all who seek greater roles for

the individual, his town, his State, and his region. And it welcomes to the fight against Federal extremism every man of good will who shares with us the view of man as master of and never servant of government.

The Republican Party does not intend to spend this Congress or any other Congress doing nothing but copycatting administration programs but at bargain prices. We do not say that we must do the same things as the administration but do them better. We say there are better ways for Americans to do things.

We believe our party to be the enduring home of principles which mean real things to real people in this real world.

Republicans are not ashamed of being Republicans. They do not have to argue about what Republican means. They have spelled it out in the Republican platform of 1964. We stand on that platform and we know what it means.

It means that we have goals. It means that we have programs and promises for the America we want to build and the Americans who must do that building. It means that there is a great alternative to the great planned society.

It means that the numerical minority in this Congress still can speak with the voice of a moral majority.

It means that though we do not win rollcall votes, we can win for America the all-important second look that may save us from blindly accepting a Great Society that might be just another great mistake, just another great scheme, just another great debt—accepted without due consideration.

I will stop speaking of the Republican Party in summing up this point. I will speak of the Congress in its entirety. It is our role, our role from every seat in this House that is not sold lock, stock, and barrel to the executive, it is our role, fellow Members of Congress, our role—every one of us—to tell the men and women to whom we owe our election and our service just one urgent thing: what lies at the end of the road of the Great Society.

It is up to Republicans and to those Members of the other party who share our views to speak of what roads other than the Great Society are available to the American people if they turn an articulate minority into an effective majority in the 90th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans cannot succeed in enacting a program in this Congress—obviously. We do not have the votes. But we can succeed in developing new techniques of communication to inform the people of what we are doing and will do in the 89th Congress, and more importantly, of what we propose to do in the 90th Congress.

For it is in the 90th Congress that the present minority will have the votes. We will have the votes to enact into law the sound Republican alternatives we will continue to develop for those areas where there is a national need and a need for a national solution.

REVITALIZATION OF THE MINORITY

The task we face in this Congress is staggering. But the record we will write will be an impressive one for we shall set

an example of unity and dedication for the entire party.

Where there is need for constructive alternatives, they will be devised. A legislative program to implement the Republican platform of 1964 is being developed right now. Some alternatives have already been introduced into the Congress. For example:

A more comprehensive and more equitable health care plan for the elderly was proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

A more realistic approach than the discriminatory Appalachia program which sets up the machinery for widespread Federal favoritism has been offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

A Republican task force on the implementation of the 1964 platform has been operating for weeks. Another task force on economic opportunity and one on agriculture has been established. There will be more in the days and weeks ahead.

A Republican coordinating committee with representatives from all elements of the party structure has been established and is operating.

In short, Mr. Speaker, our party is organizing its resources on a scale never before attempted. This stems from a determination to discharge a great responsibility: to the 43 percent of the American electorate who voted for Republican congressional candidates; to the growing number of millions who, in the weeks and months ahead, surely will wish they could recast their vote for the national ticket; and to the great numbers of other Americans who were so skillfully misled about the principles and policies of the Republican Party.

Republican opportunity to identify and then discharge these responsibilities is almost unbounded in this Congress and in its successor.

The issues we as a party defined and articulated in our 1962 statement of principle and our 1964 platform have not disappeared. If anything, they have taken on a new significance.

The shortcomings and misdeeds of the Johnson administration have not been corrected. They need a more imaginative exposure.

THE 1964 PLATFORM

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the comments and read the analyses of the 1964 Republican platform. As one who, in an apparent minority, has read the document and as one who was intimately involved in its evolution, I would be forced to conclude that the references were to some other document in some other period of history.

The fact is that this was one of the most widely misrepresented and least read documents in political party history.

The charge, for example, that its civil rights plank was weak and equivocal cannot stand the test of an objective reading of that plank. Even less can it stand the test of a line-by-line, word-by-word, or content-versus-content comparison with its Democratic counterpart.

It is clear to this observer that the Republican platform contained a comprehensive, well-thought-out, and realistic

program for America that reflects the feelings of a majority of Americans. I cannot and will not concede that our platform was repudiated by the American people. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it simply was not fairly presented to them.

That it was not is attributable to two principal factors: that too few Republican candidates waged their campaigns primarily on the platform; and that the opposition deliberately misrepresented what the platform did contain.

This has been discussed so far as civil rights is concerned. It was equally true for social security and agriculture, to mention just two other areas.

The fiction was created that Republicans would abolish or make voluntary the social security system. The platform was quite clear in its call, not for abolition, but for strengthening the social security system. It called for increased benefits, liberalization of the earnings limitations imposed by the system on our elderly people, and other fiscally and compassionately sound proposals.

The fiction was also created that the platform called for the removal of farm price supports overnight. One simple quote from the document should dispel this false interpretation. The platform was clear in its call for "development of truly voluntary commodity programs for commercial agriculture, including price supports free of political manipulation in order to stimulate and attain fair market prices."

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the minority party in the 89th Congress faces a staggering task. Not only must it dispel the false and mischievous misrepresentations of its policies but it must break through the overwhelming barriers any minority, by its very nature, must face.

ONE-PARTY GOVERNMENT

We should have no illusions about our ability to prevent an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress from enacting into law every piece of legislation the ADA tells the White House the Congress should enact, from medicare to repeal of section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley.

Under present circumstances, it cannot be lost on the American people that we have come to the dangerous brink of one-party government.

Talk of efficiency if you will; talk of parliamentary skill and persuasion if you will; talk of noble goals—the truth remains that the great consensus of the Great Society really boils down to a great conformity.

We cannot let it be lost on the American people that President Johnson has precisely this in mind when he calls for "national unity" and a "broad American consensus."

For behind these terms, we can already see emerging the clear outlines of an all-powerful central executive with one dominant voice, requesting not unity but demanding and dictating conformity.

The Congress has already experienced consensus government with the closing of veterans facilities and the overturned House vote on sales for local currency under Public Law 480 to Nasser's aggressive and collectivist Egypt.

We will continue to experience it as medicare, Appalachia, education, and a host of other Great Society proposals are rubber stamped through a no longer deliberative Congress.

This is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that all Great Society proposals are ill conceived. But in past Congresses, it was the practice to hold meaningful hearings, discuss the merits and shortcomings of a particular bill, and allow at least a token amount of time to offer and enact improving and perfecting amendments.

Under the Great Society, the 89th Congress promises to become a lost weekend in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, if one-party government is indeed the present administration's goal, and if it comes to pass, the checks and balances written into our Constitution will become all but meaningless.

The brake system of the American Republic which prevents concentrated power from running rampant over our liberties is the separation of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Central Government.

But the system cannot work without the brake fluid of a strong two-party system. This is especially true when one party controls both the White House and the Congress with overwhelming majorities and cares little for the effective operation of our traditional principles and machinery.

THE RETREAT OF FREEDOM

In this country, Mr. Speaker, the beacon of liberty for some two centuries, individual liberty continues to beat a retreat under the mounting assault of an expanding centralized power.

We in the minority claim no monopoly of love of freedom.

But we cannot forget that the President of the United States, in the Detroit Labor Day speech which launched his campaign for the Presidency, outlined the essential ingredients of his Great Society, and that these ingredients were peace, prosperity, and justice—all eminently worthy goals, but all equally attainable in a Federal penitentiary.

In that speech, Mr. Speaker, the President neglected the fourth and by far, the most important element of any good or great society. That element is freedom.

Nor, apparently, was this oversight, an isolated lapse. A reading of the many messages sent to the Congress in the last 2 months indicates that this administration still has a blind spot so far as freedom is concerned—whether that freedom involves the freedom of the individual, or the freedom of the Congress, or the freedom of the States and localities, or the freedom of the marketplace.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we in the minority challenge as unwise the course charted by the Johnson administration; we challenge as dangerous the steps it plans along the way; and we deplore as self-defeating and harmful many of the moves already taken.

It is not my intention here to enumerate the hundreds of transgressions committed against liberty by this administration in its first term of office. Those transgressions are spelled out in section II of the 1964 Republican platform

which was written under the direction of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]. Nothing has yet happened to cause the minority to withdraw or modify any of the charges contained therein. On the contrary, much has happened to strengthen that conviction.

It is my intention to speak of what we in the minority will attempt to do in the 89th Congress on the domestic front and what we shall seek to influence in the area of foreign and defense policy.

THE GREAT SOCIETY

Up until now, Mr. Speaker, we have been relatively silent. This silence did not arise from a fear to speak or from fearful concern for our image or from concern that the American people have little interest in opinions contrary to those expressed by the planners of the Great Society.

Our silence has been dictated by a need of the American people. They needed time—uncomplicated by conflicting comment—to absorb the full initial impact of the Great Society proposals.

They have listened to a state of the Union message, an economic message, an inaugural address. They have seen the messages on health of the Nation, on education, on immigration—they have now had time to see most of the first year program of the Great Society.

It is difficult for most Americans fully to understand what it all means. Most of the programs will be enacted in the 89th Congress; but it will take at least 4 years for the administration itself fully to realize what has finally been enacted to launch the Great Society.

Mr. Speaker, this is not meant to be overly critical. But the programmatic details of the Great Society do raise certain fundamental questions. Permit me to illustrate with just one area—urban affairs.

Under the Great Society, Congress is urged to create a new Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist in the problems of the cities and their suburbs.

The President said:

We must increasingly help our cities to develop unified metropolitan transportation systems; supply adequate water and sewage service; provide community facilities and neighborhood centers; build adequate housing for low- and middle-income families; promote more efficient land use; set aside open spaces and develop new suburbs; replace or rehabilitate slum areas; and improve housing codes and code enforcement.

Under another section of his program, crime prevention, the President proposes that local police be trained by the Federal Government.

The question which immediately comes to mind is: Where do the States and localities come into this picture? What is left as a responsibility for the States to discharge? Is the era of the Great Society also the era when our States and localities will finally become mere administrative arms of the Central Government?

It is at this point, Mr. Speaker, where we come to one of the greatest areas of Republican responsibility.

It is possible—it may even be probable—that this is indeed what the Ameri-

can people really want. It may be that we have passed through certain stages in the development of our country and that we are entering a new phase—a phase in which most governmental, political, economic, and social questions for the entire country are faced, diagnosed, and resolved in one manner or another at one level of government—the Federal level.

As I say, this may be what the American people want. But, I submit, if it is, it is by default Republican responsibility to apprise them of the fundamental changes that are taking place and that are being proposed in their form of government. I would hope that we all could agree that this is necessary so that the people may make an informed and intelligent decision as to whether this is the road they now wish to travel.

REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Speaker, the minority remains true to its philosophy of government. This philosophy calls for a separation of powers, for a distribution of responsibility between the Central Government on the one hand and the States and localities on the other—and, perhaps, above all, for the continued existence of a strong, viable two-party system.

The so-called consensus government which is being proposed and vigorously promoted flies in the face of this traditional system. It looks rather to an overriding Central Government which concerns itself with all areas of our national life, which dislikes dissent and diversity, and which would, in a very narrow sense of the word, make us one people, based not on a unity of purpose but on a conformity with the purposes set for us by the Government in Washington.

I repeat, it is Republican responsibility to inform the American people of what is in store under the Great Society.

I also repeat, this may be what they want.

But I, for one, do not believe it for a minute.

Not believing it, I see as a second and equally important responsibility, that Republicans articulate and continue to espouse Republican principles and Republican policies so that the people may know what alternatives are available.

In some cases, under Republican principles, there are no alternatives, constructive or otherwise, to administration proposals.

Republicans view the Constitution as a living instrument. They see limitations imposed by that Constitution on areas in which the Central Government has neither the right nor the duty to tread.

The Appalachia regional development bill provides a good illustration. There are several regions of the country which include areas just as hard pressed as certain areas in Appalachia. As a matter of fact, Menominee County in my own congressional district is one of the most hard-pressed areas in the country. It will not qualify under Appalachia.

There are also pockets of prosperity in the Appalachian region which do not need the special aid that the Appalachia bill is designed to provide. But it will be available to these pockets of prosperity in Appalachia while it remains unavail-

able to the pockets of impoverishment in other areas of the country.

Thus, under Republican philosophy, there is no constructive alternative to the Appalachia bill so long as we continue to talk only of Appalachia. Nor would a Republican in the White House view the Appalachia approach as the best means to solve these problems. But numerical realities make it clear that some form of Appalachia will be enacted into law. Recognizing this, Republicans seek to improve the program that in all probability will be rubberstamped through Congress, anyway.

Thus, a Republican alternative, an infinitely more equitable one, which has already been offered as a Republican substitute for the Appalachia bill, will make these programs and funds available to any area in the United States that can qualify legitimately as an area in need.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Republican way. We do not cast around for a problem that needs solving so that we can offer a Federal program for that problem. We believe there are certain principles that have characterized the American Republic since its inception and we attempt to adhere to those principles.

REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES

The broad principles which guide the programs and policies of the Republican Party are basically five in number. They were stated in our 1962 statement of principle. They were restated in our 1964 platform. They are:

First. That every person has the right to govern himself, to fix his own goals, and to make his own way with a minimum of governmental interference.

Second. That it is for Government to foster and maintain an environment of freedom, encouraging every individual to develop to the fullest his God-given powers of mind, heart, and body; and, beyond this, Government should undertake only needful things, rightly of public concern, which the citizen cannot himself accomplish.

Third. That within our Republic the Federal Government should act only in areas where it has constitutional authority to act, and then only in respect to proven needs where individuals and local or State governments will not or cannot adequately perform. Great power, whether governmental or private, political or economic, must be so checked, balanced, and restrained and, where necessary, so dispersed as to prevent it from becoming a threat to freedom any place in the land.

Fourth. That it is a high mission of Government to help assure equal opportunity for all, affording every citizen an equal chance at the starting line but never determining who is to win or lose. But Government must also reflect the Nation's compassionate concern for those who are unable, through no fault of their own, to provide adequately for themselves.

Fifth. That Government must be restrained in its demands upon and its use of the resources of the people, remembering that it is not the creator but the steward of the wealth it uses; that its goals must ever discipline its means;

and that service to all the people, never to selfish or partisan ends, must be the abiding purpose of men entrusted with public power.

REPUBLICAN PROPOSALS AND ALTERNATIVES

Based on these principles, the Republican Party has developed a comprehensive, compassionate, and compelling program for America and its people. It is contained in the 1964 Republican platform.

Specifically, through the platform implementation committee of the Republican conference and the good offices of the entire Republican membership on the House side, legislation is being introduced now and will be in the days and weeks ahead to implement Republican commitments.

FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

This program will include legislation that recognizes that there is a need to assist individuals but which recognizes as well that government must first have faith in the individual's own capacity to determine for himself his economic, political, and social goals.

Such a program includes legislation designed to—

Enlarge employment opportunities for urban and rural citizens, with emphasis on training programs to equip them with needed skills, recognizing that for every job seeker in America today, there actually is a job available and that the overriding problem is to develop skills in the unemployed to match these available jobs.

Provide full coverage of all medical and hospital costs for needy elderly people, financed by general revenues rather than the compulsory Democratic scheme covering only a small percentage of such costs for everyone regardless of need.

Revision of the social security laws to allow higher earnings, without loss of benefits, by our elderly people.

Furnish tax credits for those burdened by the expenses of college education.

Stimulate employers to hire teenagers through such measures as a broadening of temporary exemptions under the minimum wage law.

Improve our vocational rehabilitation programs, through cooperation between government—Federal and State—and industry, for the mentally and physically handicapped, the chronically unemployed, and the poverty stricken.

Continue the advancement of education on all levels through such programs as selective aid to higher education, strengthened State and local tax resources, including tax credits for college education. In keeping with this, legislation has already been introduced, as in past years, to return a portion of federally collected taxes to the States to be earmarked for educational uses only.

Provide our farmers, who have contributed so much to the strength of our Nation, with the maximum opportunity to exercise their own management decisions on their own farms, while resisting all efforts to impose upon them further Federal controls.

Enact legislation, despite Democratic opposition, to curb the flow through the

mail of obscene materials, which has flourished into a multimillion-dollar obscenity racket.

Espouse such additional administrative and legislative actions as may be required to end the denial, for whatever unlawful reason, of the right to vote.

In these and other legislative matters dealing with the individual, it is and will continue to be the Republican way to assure the individual of maximum freedom as government meets its proper responsibilities, while resisting the Democratic obsession to impose from above, uniform and rigid schemes for meeting varied and complex human problems.

FOR OUR COMPETITIVE SYSTEM

The Republican program sets legislative goals that are in keeping with traditional Republican understanding of and faith in the competitive system.

In keeping with this understanding, legislation has been or will be introduced which is designed to—

Remove those wartime Federal excise taxes which, until this Congress, were favored by the administration, on such items as pens, pencils, furs, jewelry, cosmetics, luggage, handbags, wallets, and toiletries.

Improve the antitrust statutes, coupled with a demand for long-overdue clarification of Federal policies and interpretations relating thereto in order to strengthen competition and protect the consumer and small business.

Provide meaningful safeguards against irreparable injuries to any domestic industries by disruptive surges of imports, such as in the case of beef and other meat imports.

Require that labels of imported items clearly disclose their foreign origin, even though such legislation was vetoed by the Democratic administration in the 88th Congress.

In these and other matters dealing with our competitive system, it is and will continue to be the Republican way vigorously to protect the dynamo of economic growth—free, competitive enterprise—that has made America the envy of the world.

FOR LIMITED GOVERNMENT

And finally, the Republican program in the 89th Congress will foster legislation designed to guarantee the Government effective but limited powers, designed to encourage frugal and efficient operations, and so framed as to insure that it fully meet its constitutional responsibilities to all the American people, and not just to a politically expedient few.

In keeping with this philosophy, legislation has been or will be introduced designed to—

Develop truly voluntary commodity programs for commercial agriculture, including payments in kind out of Government-owned surpluses, diversion of unneeded land to conservation uses, price supports free of political manipulation in order to stimulate and attain fair market prices, together with adequate credit facilities and continued support of farmer-owned and operated cooperatives including rural electric and telephone facilities, while resisting all efforts to

make the farmer dependent, for his economic survival, upon either compensatory payments by the Federal Government or upon the whim of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Provide credit against Federal taxes for specified State and local taxes paid, and a transfer to the States of excise and other Federal tax sources, to reinforce the fiscal strength of State and local governments so that they may better meet rising school costs and other pressing urban and suburban problems such as transportation, housing, water systems, and juvenile delinquency.

Amend the Constitution so as to enable States having bicameral legislatures to apportion one house on bases of their choosing, including factors other than population.

Completely reform the tax structure, to include simplification as well as lower rates to strengthen individual and business incentives.

Effect wide-ranging reforms in congressional procedures, including the provision of adequate professional staff assistance for the minority membership on congressional committees, to insure that the power and prestige of Congress remain adequate to the needs of our times.

In these and other matters dealing with our faith in limited government, it is and will continue to be the Republican way to foster genuine, not feigned savings, to allow a reduction of the public debt and additional tax reductions while meeting the proper responsibilities of government.

In all that we do or attempt to do on the domestic level, Republicans will be guided by our principles, our consciences, and our constituents' best interests.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Speaker, Republicans do not view the domestic scene as their only, or even their primary responsibility. In this crisis-torn era of history, the conduct of our Nation's foreign policy takes on an importance hard to describe.

As we turn our attention outward, beyond our own shores, we see in the world both danger and opportunity.

The manifest nature of the American people shows an overwhelming desire for peace based upon the dignity of man.

Being an idealistic people, we frequently find our ideals beclouding reality. We are beguiled by words which, on the surface, reflect our desires, without scrupulously investigating motives and subsequent results.

Our goals too often seem to be to gain popularity rather than respect, to be based upon expediency rather than principle. In all fairness, I must hastily add, these do not seem to be the goals of the people but of some of their leaders.

NATO

In any event, an example of the consequences of this orientation can be seen in NATO.

This necessary alliance is collapsing. This is primarily due to a lack of respect for our word. Our official statements are certainly high sounding enough and appear to reflect reasoned judgment, but

we are not believed, and our motives are constantly questioned.

We say we will defend Europe from nuclear attack. Yet we refuse to share control of the very weapons required to deter an attack.

At the same time, our actions indicate that we are seeking an accommodation with the Soviets, whom most of our allies recognize as the potential enemy.

The results?

France is building her own nuclear force; Turkey, one of our staunchest allies, has been negotiating agreements with Moscow for the first time in over 25 years; Greece, in an unprecedented move, has recently concluded agreements with Bulgaria; Cyprus continues to accept Soviet military aid.

THE SATELLITES

Mr. Speaker, the administration talks of building bridges to Eastern Europe to knock down the barriers of distrust. The bridges, however, have toll gates at both ends. Here in Washington, the gate is controlled by the Executive. At the other end, it is controlled by the Communist dictatorship. In either case, the people do not have an opportunity to judge results or to conduct free exchanges with one another. These exchanges are, in actuality, only government to government.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

In southeast Asia, we continue a policy that has caused thousands of South Vietnamese and American casualties, with no effective plan in sight to end this conflict. We continue the fiction that it is a South Vietnamese war, that we are only there as advisers, and that the recent retaliatory strikes are a direct result of attacks on American soldiers and possessions.

Mr. Speaker, we are presently in an impossible situation in Vietnam for one very simple reason: Laos. The fate of South Vietnam was all but sealed on the day our Government joined in the declaration and protocol on the neutrality of Laos in 1962. On that day, the United States, for the first time, accepted the troika principle in which a Communist government was given an absolute veto over taking any action on violations of that agreement.

As a result, there have been well over 2,700 separate and distinct violations and not a single citation to that effect by the International Control Commission, thanks to the veto possessed by Poland.

The situation in South Vietnam cannot be resolved effectively or satisfactorily for free world interests until the United States frankly asserts that it is no longer bound by the declaration and protocol on the neutrality of Laos because of the repeated violations on the part of the Communists.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more and more likely that some sort of negotiated settlement eventually may be sought by the present administration to extricate itself from that area of the world.

It is becoming clear that the Communists this time will not settle merely for a settlement affecting only Vietnam—they will demand, and believe they

have some prospect of getting, a regional settlement in which it is more than conceivable that Formosa, the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu, and Korea will figure prominently.

Nor is it unreasonable to expect that the present stepped-up activities of the Vietcong augur flareups in other parts of the world. Let us not forget that when missiles were introduced in Cuba, India was attacked. Or, when the seemingly inexplicable Gulf of Tonkin incident took place, it occurred on the very day that Stanleyville in the Congo, a very strategic location, was taken over by Communist-backed rebels.

The present Vietcong activity could be prelude to a similar flareup in some strategic part of the world. And it would not be surprising if that flareup occurred in a heretofore long-dormant area such as South Korea.

There is, in my mind, little doubt that the conflict in Vietnam will end in the not-too-distant future in some form of compromised settlement that cannot help but lead to an eventual Communist takeover.

It has been shown repeatedly that the fall of South Vietnam will lead to the fall of all southeast Asia, thus putting our Western line of defense closer to Hawaii and the western coast of the United States.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Closer to home, Mr. Speaker, we appear to be living up to an understanding with the Soviets not to invade or allow a reinvansion of Cuba. More importantly, we have been ineffective in preventing communism from being exported to other countries in South America. We allow and even promote socialistic forms of government throughout Latin and South America, totally ignoring the fact that socialism is a vehicle for eventual Communist takeover.

AFRICA

Our policies in Africa, especially in the Congo, are reminiscent of our condemnation of Chiang in China prior to the Communist takeover there. In all of our actions concerning so-called colonialism, we have been very quick on the trigger of condemnation of what we feel are Western weaknesses but we have been unforgivably slow to defend our strengths.

THE UNITED NATIONS

We loudly proclaim the necessity of the U.N., yet we inhibit its potential by abandoning courses that are objectively correct in order to take those which will be popularly received. What greater example of this can there be than our Ambassador's retreat 2 weeks ago from the rule of law as set forth by the World Court on the question of the Soviet Union's credentials to vote without paying past dues?

In short, Mr. Speaker, we have sought the love of the world and we have lost its respect.

We agree that the greatest threat to world peace is the advancement of communism, and its main deterrent is the United States. Yet this administration has not pursued research and development policies that will assure our coun-

try's strength for the next decade. We must be capable of continuing to act as the shield and the sword of free people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has created a weapon of wind to promote its foreign policy. Since World War II, millions of hours of talk with the Soviet and Chinese Communists have resulted in our losing land, people, and trade—all in staggering amounts—to the Communist bloc.

Our leaders interpret these losses as victories because they say each setback prevented a nuclear attack. The fact that we have weakened ourselves and other free nations throughout the world, thereby heightening the danger of nuclear attack, seems not to have entered their thinking. They subscribe with a blind faith to the very debatable proposition that communism someday will lose its aggressiveness and, thus, make all the concessions worthwhile.

THE ALTERNATIVES

The immediate and superficial interpretation which will be placed on the foregoing remarks is that they are of the hard line school of thought, and politically partisan. They would fall into the category of old myths, that are no longer conversant with the new realities.

Well, they are old, as old as America's courage. And they do not square with the new realities of accommodation and retreat at the expense of respect and long-held principles.

What do they mean? They mean lasting peace—peace with honor, freedom, and justice—they mean that moral principles are applicable to nations as well as men, and that the freedom of all men is threatened when there are enslaved peoples anywhere.

Communist and Fascist dictators alike recognize that the greatest threat to their continued existence is their peoples' hope for freedom and their knowledge that freedom does exist somewhere in the world.

Our policies, therefore, must preserve freedom where it does exist and promote conditions that would serve to extend it.

It cannot be denied that such policies would not be looked upon with favor by the Communists and would incur certain risks.

But policies which seek accommodations with dictators, that strengthen rather than weaken their positions, are a greater threat.

Weakness, real or apparent, has always led to war.

The first objective of our policies must be to maintain the strength of the United States, morally, politically, economically, and militarily. We must regain the respect we once had from all nations of the world. We must do this by showing in word and deed that freedom, honor, and principle are still the touchstones of the American dream, and that others may share in it by following our example.

All of this must begin with a proper understanding of the world as it is and of the true nature of the conflict we face.

Our leaders must base their decisions on integrity and courage, recognizing that the times in which we live are nei-

ther safe nor simple and probably will not be in our lifetime.

There is an easier road to follow—but that road leads to defeat and slavery if the past is indeed prologue.

It has been intimated that the American people lack the courage of their forefathers but I cannot believe this for a minute.

Given a clear understanding of events both at home and abroad, there would be on the part of the American people an overwhelming determination to sacrifice whatever is necessary and to face whatever problems may arise with courage and dignity.

Such a posture, on the part of the American people, would be sufficient to deter war and insure a peace that would last for generations.

Given the posture of such a foundation, fostered by our leaders, and fully backed by our people, we could expect the following types of decisions and actions by our Government. They represent excerpts of what was contained in the 1964 Republican platform, drafted and adopted some 7 months ago.

REPUBLICAN PROPOSALS

America must advance freedom throughout the world as a vital condition of orderly human progress, universal justice, and the security of the American people.

The supreme challenge to this policy is an atheistic imperialism-communism.

In our foreign policy, the overriding national goal must be victory over communism through the establishment of a world in which men can live in freedom, security, and national independence. There can be no real peace short of it.

So long as Communist leaders remain ideologically fixed upon ruling the world, there can be no lesser goal.

Therefore, our first duty is to regain a trust both in ourselves and our allies. Secrecy in foreign policy must be at a minimum, public understanding at a maximum. Consultation with our allies should take precedence over direct negotiations with Communist powers.

In the United Nations, our Government should press for a change in the method of voting in the General Assembly and in the specialized agencies that will reflect population disparities among the member States and recognize differing abilities and willingness to meet the obligations of the charter.

An amending convention, which is provided for in the charter itself and which is not subject to a single veto by one nation on the Security Council, should be sought immediately by our delegation at the U.N.

We should insist upon General Assembly acceptance of the International Court of Justice Advisory opinion, upholding denial of the votes of member nations which refuse to meet properly levied assessments, so that the United Nations will more accurately reflect the power realities of the world. This is the first and perhaps most important step in recognizing in this world the rule of law.

We should never surrender to any international group, however, the responsibility of the United States for its sov-

eighty, its own security, and the leadership of the free world.

Regarding NATO, our Government should move immediately to establish an international commission, comprised of individuals of high competence in NATO affairs, whether in or out of government to explore and recommend effective new ways to strengthen alliance participation and fulfillment.

To our Nation's associates in SEATO and CENTO, our Government should pledge reciprocal dedication of purpose and revitalized interest.

THE GEOGRAPHY OF FREEDOM

In diverse regions of the world, our Government should make clear to any hostile nation that the United States will increase the costs and risks of aggression to make them outweigh hopes for gain.

Our German friends should be reassured that the United States will not accept any plan for the future of Germany which lacks firm assurance of a free election on reunification.

Our Government should vigorously press our OAS partners to join the United States in restoring a free and independent government in Cuba, stopping the spread of Sino-Soviet subversion, forcing the withdrawal of the foreign military presence now in Latin America, and preventing future intrusions.

It should be made clear to all Communists now supporting or planning to support guerrilla and subversive activities, that henceforth there will be no privileged sanctuaries to protect those who disrupt the peace of the world.

Our foreign aid programs should be recast in such a way that all will serve the cause of freedom, permitting none to bolster and sustain anti-American regimes and that the use of private capital is increased on a partnership basis with foreign nationals as a means of fostering independence and mutual respect.

In short, our Government should adhere to the principle that freedom's wealth should never support freedom's decline, always its growth. Aid and assistance should always be conditional upon self-help and progress toward the development of free institutions. Our Government should favor and foster the establishment in underdeveloped nations of an economic and political climate that will encourage the investment of local capital and attract the investment of foreign capital.

FREEDOM'S SHIELD AND SWORD

Finally, the condition of the world today and in the foreseeable future requires that our Nation be strong militarily.

This is necessary to maintain peace in our time.

Strength, however, is not merely the quantitative and qualitative superiority of weapons. It is equally and more importantly the will and determination of the people and their leaders.

By themselves, nuclear bombs cannot start wars.

By themselves, nuclear bombs cannot deter wars.

With the awesome power of today's weapons, it is not enough to be militarily equipped to win a war. There must

be a superiority in a balance of weapons to prevent an aggressor from exploiting a weakness, as well as a credible posture which convinces any would-be aggressor that the power will be used should the occasion demand.

This has not been evident in our past policies.

Under present American leadership, an inflexible and unconvincing posture has been created. At one end of the spectrum, they have relied almost solely upon missiles to act as deterrents to or as the actual weapons of a nuclear war.

At the other end, they have built up guerrilla forces but have made it clear to our potential enemy that we will not use them without the express consent of the country involved, that in some cases we may not even participate directly and that we will not pursue the enemy guerrilla activity to its source of power and support.

The recent strikes authorized by the administration on North Vietnamese territory are encouraging signs. It is to be hoped—although candor dictates that it is a weak hope—that in the future the administration will deny the Communists the immunity of a privileged sanctuary by applying the same ground rules to the South Vietnamese that the North Vietnamese guerrillas have been enjoying with impunity.

In short, knowing the nature of guerrilla warfare, unless the source of supply is cut off or destroyed, time is on the side of the aggressor, providing him with the probable margin of victory.

This administration has taken the position that the quantity and quality of arms starts or invites war. They are taking steps to cut back in this decade both quantitatively and qualitatively our defense program. The fact that the Communist bloc, an admitted aggressor, has made no concrete provable steps in the same direction seems to be of minor secondary importance to our idealistic decisionmakers.

This administration has stated, and we agree, that today we have a distinct superiority. They have not made similar statements about what our position will be in the late sixties and; more importantly, in the decade of the seventies, without a number of qualifying conditions.

The weapons we have today, and in most cases their programed quantity, were inherited from the Eisenhower administration either as actual hardware or in the form of well-developed plans.

Today, we do not have either the new generation of weapons prudence requires, or the specific plans to develop them in time.

It has been assumed that such criticisms imply the need for significant increases in the defense budget. Actually, the opposite is more probably true. The reorientation being proposed here would use funds properly, both in recognition of the needs of the political-military requirements and in their timely application.

Republicans have proposed in the past, and still propose today, a positive program designed to keep our Nation's sword sharp, ready, and dependable.

Specific Republican proposals to accomplish this end were contained in the 1964 Republican platform.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the section of the Republican platform of 1964, entitled "Freedom's Shield and Sword," be inserted in the Record. This section was drafted under the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Mr. Speaker, in the field both of defense and foreign affairs, events of recent months have clearly indicated the correctness of the positions proposed in the Republican platform of 1964.

Conditions on the world scene, such as developments in NATO and southeast Asia prove the ineptness of our present policies, and the inconsistencies of those being proposed.

In defense, the various program cancellations and indications of what the new budget will contain show that the basic thinking of this administration is leading us dangerously close to unilateral disarmament and placing serious risks upon the country and the free world as a whole.

It is to be devoutly hoped that the Johnson administration will undertake a serious and penetrating reevaluation of our basic policies in the interest of freedom and security for this Nation and the whole free world.

Mr. Speaker, whether the Executive will, or will not, we Republicans stand ready to work with all of our colleagues in the Congress to assure that the voice of the American people still may be heard at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

And we warn all of our colleagues that, unless the legislative branch stands for something more than a rubber stamp, it is not Republicans who will be a minority—it will be the entire Congress, dwarfed and dragooned by a great and overbearing executive branch.

The section of the Republican platform referred to above follows:

FREEDOM'S SHIELD—AND SWORD

Finally, Republicans pledge to keep the Nation's sword sharp, ready, and dependable.

We will maintain a superior, not merely equal, military capability as long as the Communist drive for world domination continues. It will be a capability of balanced force, superior in all its arms, maintaining flexibility for effective performance in the rapidly changing science of war.

Republicans will never unilaterally disarm America.

We will demand that any arms reduction plan worthy of consideration guarantee reliable inspection. We will demand that any such plan assure this Nation of sufficient strength, step by step, to forestall and defend against possible violations.

We will take every step necessary to carry forward the vital military research and development programs. We will pursue these programs as absolutely necessary to assure our Nation of superior strength in the 1970's.

We will revitalize research and development programs needed to enable the Nation to develop advanced new weapons systems, strategic as well as tactical.

We will include the fields of antisubmarine warfare, astronautics and aeronautics, special guerrilla forces, and such other defense systems required to keep America ready for any threat.

We will fully implement such safeguards as our security requires under the limited

nuclear test ban treaty. We will conduct advanced tests in permissible areas, maintain facilities to test elsewhere in case of violations, and develop to the fullest our ability to detect Communist transgressions. Additionally, we will regularly review the status of nuclear weaponry under the limited nuclear test ban to assure this Nation's protection. We shall also provide sensible, continuing reviews of the treaty itself.

We will end second-best weapons policies. We will end the false economies which place price ahead of the performance upon which American lives may depend. Republicans will bring an end once again to the "peak and valley" defense planning, so costly in morale and strength as well as in dollars. We will prepare a practical civil defense program.

We will restore the morale of our Armed Forces by upgrading military professionalism, and we will allow professional dissent while insuring that strong and sound civilian authority controls objective decisionmaking.

We will return the Joint Chiefs of Staff to their lawful status as the President's principal military advisers. We will insure that an effective planning and operations staff is restored to the National Security Council.

We will reconsecrate this Nation to human liberty, assuring the freedom of our people, and rallying mankind to a new crusade for freedom all around the world.

We Republicans, with the help of Almighty God, will keep those who would bury America aware that this Nation has the strength and also the will to defend its every interest. Those interests, we shall make clear, include the preservation and expansion of freedom—and ultimately its victory—every place on earth.

We do not offer the easy way. We offer dedication and perseverance, leading to victory. This is our platform. This is the Republican way.

MIDDLE EAST ARMS RACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it was most disturbing to read in Sunday's New York Times:

The administration is being drawn deeper into the accelerating arms race in the Middle East by requests for arms from Jordan and Saudi Arabia. (New York Times, Feb. 28, 1965.)

According to the Times, Saudi Arabia is interested in buying modern jet fighters and bombers. The United States has supplied Saudi Arabia with F-86 jet fighters, jet trainers, and B-26 bombers as well as transports.

Jordan is interested in receiving modern tanks and other modern military equipment. Since 1957, the United States has been supplying Jordan with approximately \$4 million of military assistance every year with the exception of 1959 when there were no arms shipments.

It is clear from these recent requests and from the military buildup over the last several years that there is an arms race in the Middle East. This arms race presents a grave threat not only to the democracy of Israel but also to world peace. It is inconceivable that a major war in this sensitive area would not involve the great powers. The possibility that the arms race in the Middle East will inevitably result in the introduction of nuclear weapons in that area makes

the situation critical. This is no idle concern. Nasser has already employed German scientists to work on a missile program.

In view of the situation in the Middle East, it would be supreme folly for the United States to sanction further military aid to Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The power, prestige, and influence of the United States should be used to bring about peace in the area, not to accelerate the arms race. On February 19, 1965, the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara stated in regard to the Middle East:

A principal U.S. objective has long been to keep the feud from escalating into overt hostilities.

I can think of no act more calculated to escalate the feud than for the United States to increase military aid to Arab States.

Mr. Speaker, because of the grave situation in the Middle East, I have written to the Secretary of State urging that the proposed sale of military equipment to Jordan and Saudi Arabia be disapproved. Tomorrow I will introduce again the concurrent resolution concerning the situation in the Middle East, which I sponsored in the 88th Congress. This resolution would make clear that the policy of the United States is to discourage an arms race in the Near East. The resolution also reaffirms the tripartite declaration of May 1950, in which the United States, Britain, and France are committed to take action both within and outside the United Nations if any state in the area should use force or threaten to use force in violation of the Arab-Israeli armistice agreement. The resolution also urges that the United States use its good offices to negotiate with the Middle Eastern States an agreement banning nuclear weapons in that area under an international policing system.

The United States must do everything it can to insure peace in the Middle East. Increased armaments for the Arab world are not conducive to stability in that troubled area.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the text of my resolution:

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas tensions in the Near East are steadily mounting; and

Whereas the stability and peace of the Near East are vital to the well-being of the peoples of the Near East and to the world at large; and

Whereas the continuing arms race in the Near East threatens to enter a new stage of development of nuclear weapons and offensive missiles; and

Whereas the policy of the United States is to discourage an arms race in the Near East; and

Whereas the United States has contributed generously and impartially to promote the economic development of the states of the Near East and to raise the standard of living of their peoples; and

Whereas several of the states are wasting precious resources in order to acquire ever greater quantities and even more sophisticated types of weapons, thus partially offsetting the effects and aims of United States foreign economic and technical assistance programs; and

Whereas the acquisition of such arms serves further to heighten the tensions in

the Near East and to enhance the risk of hostilities; and

Whereas the interests of the states and peoples of the area, of the United States, and of the world in general would be served by a reduction of tensions, by an end to belligerency, and by a termination of the arms race: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States use his good offices with the states of the area to negotiate with them either through the United Nations, or directly, an agreement that nuclear weapons will neither be produced in the area nor be introduced into the area; that missiles of a mass-destruction nature will neither be produced nor be introduced into the area; that an international policing system will be adopted to enforce such agreement; and that the United States continue, in accordance with the tripartite declaration of May 1950, to take all necessary and appropriate actions both within and outside the United Nations to prevent any violation of existing frontiers or armistice lines in the Near East; and that the United States, either through the United Nations, or directly with other nations in the area, devise means to bring to an end the recriminations and incitements to violence which are contributing to tension and instability in the Near East.

ILLICIT SALE AND USE OF STIMULANT AND DEPRESSANT DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the U.S. Public Health Service, among others, have been aware of the mounting evidence of illegal traffic in the sale of barbiturates and amphetamines and the foolish and dangerous unprescribed misuse of these stimulant and depressant drugs by various elements of our population for other than medical purposes.

These stimulant-depressant drugs find their way into the illicit pathways by various names; barbiturates are called "goof balls" and the amphetamines are variously known as pep pills and bennies.

A new contemporary fad uncovered by law enforcement officers is making considerable inroads among adolescents who seek new thrills by getting "high," or "sinking low," in a fuzzy haze from experimenting with these complex drugs. The barbiturates and amphetamines resemble the characteristics of narcotics; many are addictive; all distort the senses when used wantonly; all, when abused, harm body and mind. Many produce hallucinations and some have resulted in the death of the indiscriminate users.

The problem is further compounded when users try bizarre offshoots to "kick up" the effects of the drug. Mixing them with alcoholic beverages is one practice. Another, discovered by health officers, is that whereby the experimenter takes an amphetamine to shoot sky high and then takes a barbiturate to roller coaster into the depths.

The illicit sales of these drugs and their use in seeking euphoria on the part of juveniles and adults are causing considerable concern, and problems, among the medical profession, drug manufacturers, law enforcement offi-

cials, and public health officers throughout the United States. This concern is further reflected by the introduction of H.R. 2 on January 4, 1965, by the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman OREN HARRIS, a measure which relates to the production and distribution of stimulant and depressant drugs. Smith, Kline, & French, along with several other major drug manufacturers, is also worried about the problem. The firm knows that publicity about abuse deters some sick people, who need such drugs, from taking them, even under a doctor's guidance. They know, too, that abuse tends to give the entire drug field a bad name and they are anxious to seek remedies to the problem.

Moreover, users who become addicted to these drugs resort to stealing and other crimes for money to purchase drugs from shady sources.

It is paradoxical that, on the one hand, the Government and hundreds of philanthropic organizations and health clinics are spending millions of dollars in research and treatment to control disabling diseases and to upgrade our national health, some of which are treated by the use of these drugs, while on the other hand, illicit drug peddlers are menacing the public health and public safety by bootlegging dangerous drugs for the indiscriminate use of thrill seekers and the emotionally disturbed adolescent or adult.

While I commend the action taken by the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration to restrict inhalers containing methamphetamine or its salts, as well as amphetamine inhalers, to prescription sale only, I am hopeful that Congressman HARRIS' bill will be seriously and promptly considered by the Congress, now that it has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As a Roman philosopher once said: "We should pray for a sane mind in a sound body." It is inconceivable that the benefits of our highly developed society, which do sustain good health and prolong life, are used capriciously and indiscriminately for ill gain and for seeking an unrealistic euphoria.

TIME MAGAZINE TAKES NOTES OF COTTON MESS

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, at long last a national periodical has taken note of the cotton program mess. Last year the Congress, at President Johnson's behest, piled a multimillion mill subsidy on top of a jerry-built contraption of other subsidies.

The new subsidy was supposed to result in lower program costs, and lower consumer prices. Neither has resulted, of course. In fact, about everything has

gone up—program costs, consumer prices, and mill profits.

U.S. Department of Agriculture statistics show that mills simply transferred the subsidies to their profit column, and let product prices continue their upward trend.

The current issue of Time magazine contains a brief review of the sorry situation, and I hope other periodicals will dig even deeper.

Text of the Time article follows:

KING COTTON

When it comes to subsidies, cotton is king. The Federal Government has long subsidized cotton growers. Then, when exporters complained that the farmers' subsidy priced American cotton out of overseas markets, the United States started subsidizing exporters. And last year, after textile mill owners protested that the exporters' subsidy permitted foreign mills to buy U.S. cotton cheaper than American mills could, the Johnson administration pushed through Congress a subsidy for the mills.

The argument was that with the Government shelling out 6½ cents of the 30 cents per pound paid by the mills, textile prices would fall and the consumer would benefit. This entirely ignored the fact that the consumer is also a taxpayer—and anyway, it hasn't worked out. So far, the textile industry has received a mouth-watering \$329 million in subsidies; payments have even gone to prisons whose convicts work at weaving. Textile industry profits have soared to their highest level since Korea. But there has been no dramatic drop in wholesale or retail textile prices. For example, the Agriculture Department recently reported that the price of a heavy cotton union suit has risen from \$3.07 a year earlier to \$3.14, a long-sleeved sport shirt from \$3.38 to \$3.41.

The overall cotton program was advertised as costing \$448 million during its first year. Instead, it is now expected to amount to nearly \$800 million. Reason: despite all the subsidies, exports have kept falling and production has kept rising, meaning that the Government has had to buy up still more cotton for its already bulging inventories. By last week the Commodity Credit Corporation owned a record 7,372,000 bales at a cost of \$1.2 billion, on which storage charges alone run another annual \$30 million.

In his 1965 farm message, President Johnson promised to reduce the cost of this program and the level of [cotton] stocks. But nobody expects the administration to propose more than minor alterations in the current program—and cotton is likely to remain the only U.S. crop that is subsidized from stem to steam whistle.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the first polls on the question of reapportionment which has been taken is by the Farm Journal and the results are most interesting. In the East, 4 percent voted to let the Supreme Court's decision stand and 96 percent voted for a constitutional amendment permitting the States to decide their own apportionment; in the Southeast 3 percent voted for the Court's

decision and 97 percent voted to let the States decide. The Central States voted 5 percent for the Court's decision and 95 percent voted in favor of the constitutional amendment. The West voted 3 percent for the Court's decision and 97 percent for the constitutional amendment; and in the Southwest, 2 percent voted to let the Court's decision stand and 98 percent voted for the constitutional amendment permitting the States to decide.

I sincerely hope that the discharge petition will be promptly signed by a majority of the Members of the House so that we can get the constitutional amendment to the floor for a vote.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., February 25, 1965.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On Monday, March 1, I have obtained a special order for the purpose of discussing the Supreme Court decisions on State legislative apportionment and the aims and objectives of the Members who have introduced constitutional amendments similar to the one that I have introduced.

I personally feel that we may be a little short of the two-thirds vote required although we do have a comfortable majority; and in order to clear such a measure in the House, we must make clear the very reasonable and mild nature of the proposals we are sponsoring. Today, Thursday, only 66 Members have signed the discharge petition filed by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN so we need to focus attention on our efforts.

I thought you would want to participate in the discussion and would suggest that you obtain special orders on succeeding days in order that we can keep attention directed on our efforts.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Member of Congress.

REALISM OR COMMUNISM

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a report from Mr. Robert Stanton, chairman of the board of Aris Gloves, Inc., relative to his trip around the world. This report was written from France.

In view of Mr. Stanton's long experience in worldwide trade and commerce, his views are very much worthwhile. His report from Paris follows:

REALISM OR COMMUNISM

No one can appreciate the problems of a troubled world without experiencing those troubles firsthand. It is a study in foreign relations and our inexperience. I shall try to give my impressions, not to criticize but perhaps to help one analyze what we are up against. The route by ship covered Yokohama, Hong Kong, Manila, Saigon, Singapore, Colombo, Bombay, Karachi, Djibouti, Suez, Port Said, Marseille. For a long time now it has been obvious that the removal of British, Dutch, Belgian, and French tutelage from African and Asian territories has not brought greater freedom to the individual but a loss of order and stability.

What made England the greatest colonial power of all times and how did they lose that

power? Was it America's fault? Was the Suez crisis the beginning of the end? Did England rule solely by force? Even where the English have relinquished their authority in the places we visited, they still have the respect of the people. They recognize their authority, and, in fact, still maintain a control over external issues like trade. Malaysia and Ceylon remain British protectorates.

We must recognize man's ambitions which are stimulated by American achievements but we must also recognize the inability of the backward races to appreciate a holier-than-thou attitude. This we have learned from Suez and the possible loss of the entire Middle East. Power and patience were great British attributes and with America's ascendancy as the great world power, it behooves us to learn from our British brothers how they functioned.

A great deal of misinformation is today broadcast by the Communists about our aims and our economic system. Nationalists in these former colonial regions have exploited these communistic claims. The United Nations has given them status. The colonies are entitled to their own aspirations but they should not deprive their people of the assistance and help of a friendly power or powers. They must know communism and nationalism cannot exist together.

Even France, who should understand our motives takes the position that she need not support our foreign policies because she knows that we are so irrevocably committed to peace that she can safely pursue an independent—indeed an isolationist French policy regardless of what we think of it. De Gaulle fails to recognize that a divided free world is no match for future Communist aggressions. Let him beware.

If we did not have the United Nations we would have to invent one. I do not expect that we will always be in agreement on the best means for resolving various issues even between our free nations or best friends; that is the privilege of free nations. However, I sincerely believe that on matters of vital importance to the freedom, well-being and dignity of man, we must find common ground on which we must agree.

Most of these newly developed nations are not capable of sound judgments through lack of education, and inexperienced leaders. It is the tendency of the backward nations to be moderate in their criticism of those whom they fear, and direct their blasts against those whom they can trust. Being too sensitive of world opinion, however, weakens our position, and being ultra-sensitive only impairs our prestige. Maybe the United States, in its foreign policy is too much influenced because decisions are made with an eye to the United Nations. It relies too much on the United Nations instead of implementing programs by building a cohesive community of free nations, specifically the North Atlantic nations that make up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and not use it solely as an organization for defense, as the United States must rely on its own military strength.

Whatever it is called, its motto should be moral suasion and the rule of law. Such an alliance might one day help bring peace to this earth.

Britain's importance in the world was not just a product of gunboats and regiments, and the Royal Navy maintaining the freedom of the seas. It was a response at home and abroad to the bearing of the Britons, their dispassionate intelligence, their moral rectitude, their sense of justice and selflessness which British officials everywhere left in the mind of those over whom they ruled.

The word which best describes the strength of British power over its former colonies is the simple word "integrity." It is much more effective than our image of liberality as far as the populace is concerned. Most of our liberality goes to the

governments and the people know little about it. Our State Department needs an agency to promote our forces of courage, conviction, dignity, and decision.

England saved herself by her exertions and will and the confident conviction of the power of freemen. This feeling of freemen posted across the world should be our force to fight communism, instead of favors and fortunes.

And finally, perhaps the passing of Winston Churchill will bring back the symbol of unity by which our English-speaking world saved the cause of freemen through his voice, his ideas, and his philosophy. Maybe it will awaken us to the values of the past and strike a forgotten chord in the English-speaking world by keeping something from the older world which is essential to our future. We need an effort in the United States which is human and alive—not just doles. It is that force of character which makes a nation enduring. It is that power of freemen and confident conviction of our place in the world that will win the prestige to which we are entitled.

With the end of an era and the end of our steamer voyage, I feel very strongly that President Johnson should include our foreign relations in his Great Society, if possible through a united peoples as a forum for freemen. In addition, let us show our might when we have a right to fight.

ROBERT STANTON,
Chairman of the Board,
Arts Gloves, Inc.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

FRANCES P. BOLTON: SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my neighbor in the 22d District of Ohio, my good friend and wonderful counselor, FRANCES PAINE BOLTON, is observing her silver anniversary as a U.S. Representative. We are the richer for her 25 years of unselfish public service.

To the pride of her devoted constituents, this great lady has achieved the stature of a stateswoman during her quarter century in the House. Without sacrifice of dignity or feminine charm, she has successfully sailed the sometimes rocky seas of political life. She commands the respect of the Nation for her clear-sighted leadership as ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her private endeavors in behalf of nursing have won nationwide recognition and applause.

For myself, I shall always regard her with the deepest affection for the guidance she gave me as a young Member from the 23d District when I came to the House 10 years ago and for the constancy of her friendship ever since.

As legislator, leader, friend, Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON is a remarkable lady. To a magnificent heritage of public service she brings the crown of laurels.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and delightful colleague from the 22d District of Ohio, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, marked

the 25th anniversary of her service in the Congress on the 27th of February. This attainment is unique for a woman in the annals of Ohio politics, and remarkable by any measure. However, Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON is a remarkable person, and we salute her with cordial congratulations on this happy occasion. All Ohio is very proud of her.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] in his fine tribute to my longtime friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON]. Her friendship has been one of the rewarding compensations of my service in Congress. An eloquent and talented lady, she has dignified the House of Representatives by her membership in this body for 25 years. During that time she has achieved national recognition for her untiring efforts in the complicated and critical area of our country's foreign affairs. This anniversary of her 25 years of dedicated service in Congress is an event which brings pride and happiness to those of us who have been privileged to work with her.

I desire to extend my personal congratulations to her for this magnificent record of accomplishment. And I hope the Nation may have the benefit of many more years of her unselfish and devoted service.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this day is a very meaningful one to me. I can well remember the special election which was held on February 27, 1940. There were two special elections in the State of Ohio to fill two vacancies. One seat was that of my father, William A. Ashbrook, and the other was that of the late husband of our distinguished Representative of the 22d Ohio District, Chester Castle Bolton. Hon. J. Harry McGregor was elected to fill the vacancy in the 17th District and served until he died in October 1958, while serving his constituents. The charming lady we honor today, Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, was elected to succeed her husband.

No one has served more honorably during the two troubled decades of the forties and the fifties than our esteemed colleague from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON]. She is one of the most learned Members of this body, she has traveled throughout the world and she combines a gracious manner with a dedicated interest in every problem from the smallest matter to matters of state. I delight in joining with my colleagues in paying respect to the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, a great American and, thankfully, an Ohioan with whom I have had

the rare opportunity of associating during these few years in Congress. We salute you, FRANCES, and wish you another 25 years of dedicated public service.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in paying a special tribute to FRANCES P. BOLTON. Today marks her silver anniversary in the House of Representatives, culminating 25 years of dedicated and unselfish service to her country. This gracious and lovely lady from Ohio not only gives her time to serving her own constituents and her country, but makes a great contribution to the Republican Party as well.

It is indeed a privilege to work with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] in the Congress and a great honor to know her as my friend. I hope we may have the benefit of her service for many more years to come.

SUPPORT PASSAGE TO APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. This legislation is vital to the people of Pennsylvania. As it helps them so it will also help the Nation. Because of my intense interest in helping to solve the burdensome problems of our citizens in Appalachia, I have sponsored legislation similar to that now being considered by this House.

The Schweiker bill contains better strip mining benefits than the bill which has passed the Senate and is now before us. I urge that this House improve the proposed legislation by adopting the provisions of the Schweiker Appalachia bill which would enlarge and strengthen the strip mining section and would permit meaningful action in this area in the immediate future rather than delaying this program for 2 more years.

PASSAGE OF THE IMMIGRATION REFORM BILL

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this great deliberative body, the U.S. Congress, can be keyed to change the course of history in a matter of hours or, on the other hand, it may take such a course that will seem to be a never-ending diet of inaction.

This is as it should be. The Members of this House of Representatives and our friends on the other side of the Capitol must respond to the dictates of the people that we represent. The Congress must reflect what the people want and need, always alert to the best interests of the United States.

The committees of this Congress are busy, today, conducting hearings and actively considering priority or must legislation. When these priority measures are reported by the respective committees they are scheduled for floor action.

However, Mr. Speaker, one very important proposal in President Johnson's program—legislation to reform our immigration policy—appears to be lagging behind all other priority legislation. I urge my colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee to speed up the time schedule so that this very important legislation—a proposal for immigration reform conceived by the late President Kennedy, and submitted to this Congress by President Johnson and designated by him as one of the most important programs before the Congress this session—may be enacted into law.

Let us whet the legislative process to a finely honed instrument and cut through the delay in the enactment of that important program.

For a period of over 3 months, Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee heard witnesses from all interested governmental agencies, private organizations, and private citizens express their views on our immigration policies. The record has been made and the foundation firmly established for action and for action now.

Repeal of an immigration law based on an undemocratic national origins quota system was a major goal of President Kennedy who understood the problems and appreciated the contributions of those millions who came from foreign lands to make their home in our United States.

Our late President took a special interest in immigration matters throughout his public life. He stated many times that the basic problem for our immigration policy is to choose fairly among the applicants for admission to this country. Only a few weeks ago President Kennedy's last book, "A Nation of Immigrants" pointed with pride to the great contributions made by the foreign born to our great country—undoubted contributions of people from all over the world who have given this Nation its great strength. This Nation was formed by immigrants of courage and ability. This Nation has benefited from their genius and a rich and enduring culture has been our reward.

President Johnson in his January 13, 1965, immigration message to the Congress noted that four Presidents have called attention to the serious defects in

our immigration legislation. With conviction he said:

I urge the Congress to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals. No move could more effectively reaffirm our immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged—and judged exclusively—on his worth as a human being.

The discrimination which has existed in our immigration policy for several decades can no longer go unchallenged and unheeded. The legislation to remedy our outdated and immature attitude toward immigrants is pending before this body. I repeat, we must speed up the schedule for passage of the immigration reform bill.

The House Judiciary Committee in this Congress is in a position to initiate the building of a great monument to a great President. It would be a fitting tribute, indeed, if Congress would consider the present immigration bill so that it could be passed in time for President Johnson to sign it into law on May 29—the birth date of the late President John F. Kennedy.

COPYRIGHT LAW REVISION HEARINGS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Copyright Subcommittee of which I am chairman has scheduled hearings on the copyright law revision bill, H.R. 4347, introduced by the gentleman from New York, Judiciary Committee Chairman CELLER. The hearings will begin on Wednesday, April 28, at 10 a.m.

There has been no general revision of the copyright law since 1909. Meanwhile entirely new industries involving entirely new methods of reproducing and disseminating literary and artistic works have come into existence. At the time of the enactment of the present law, the motion pictures were in their infancy, radio virtually unknown, and commercial television still far in the future. The 1909 act is no longer adequate.

For the past 10 years, the Copyright Office has been engaged in a program for the general revision of the copyright law. In 1955, pursuant to authority from Congress, it sponsored 35 studies analyzing the major problem areas under the present statute. In 1961, on the basis of these studies and comments based on them, the Register of Copyrights issued his report on the general revision of the copyright law. This report was discussed intensely at a series of meetings with a panel of consultants on general revision of the copyright law conducted by the Register in 1961 and 1962.

In July 1964, Chairman CELLER, acting at the request of the Register of Copyrights, and for the purpose of enabling

study, introduced H.R. 11947, a bill for the complete revision of the copyright law. Thereafter, the Register again met with the panel of consultants and also received a large number of statements of positions on questions of substance and suggestions for improvements in language.

The present bill, H.R. 4347, reflects the Register's revision in light of further comments received and further study.

The subcommittee wishes to afford all interested persons the opportunity of submitting their views on this vital legislation. For this purpose it has set aside Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, April 28, 29, and 30, and Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, May 5, 6, and 7, 1965. The Register of Copyrights will be heard on April 28.

Persons wishing to testify or to submit written statements relating to this measure should address Mr. Herbert Fuchs, subcommittee counsel, in room 345, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

OPERATION MUST

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, San Antonio, Tex., which I have the honor to represent in this hallowed Chamber of democracy, is one of the fastest growing centers for scientific research in America. Long renowned as one of the truly unique cities of the Nation, containing a picturesque blend of the Anglo and Latin American cultures, it has emerged in recent years as a city of science. Among the major scientific facilities in the Alamo City are Wilford Hall U.S. Air Force Hospital, the largest Air Force hospital and the largest single structure unit in the Department of Defense; Brooke Army Medical Center, world famous for its clinical treatment in the management of severe burns; Lackland Air Force Base Military Training Center; the school of aerospace medicine at Brooks Air Force Base; the Southwest Research Center; the Southwest Research Institute; and the Southwest Foundation for Research and Education.

San Antonio, the home of Kelly Air Force Base, has been called the mother of the Air Force. But also located in this great city is the Brooke Army Medical Center, and it was therefore particularly fitting for the Department of Defense and the U.S. Army to have demonstrated its newest answer to the problem of rapidly setting up military field hospitals for the care of battlefield casualties. This occurred last Wednesday, February 24, 1965, when the Army unveiled its medical unit self-contained transportable, called MUST, before members of the House Armed Services Committee and numerous other distinguished visitors to San Antonio representing the Government, industry, and medicine.

This remarkable demonstration proved beyond any doubt that we have made a spectacular breakthrough in this area of military medicine.

Among the many news services covering this important event were Time magazine, the San Antonio Express, and the San Antonio Light. With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD articles from each of these publications giving eyewitness accounts of what took place.

The tremendous success of this demonstration is a real tribute to every man and woman who participated in it, and I think special recognition ought to be given to the Secretary of the Army, Stephen Ailes, to the Surgeon General of the Army, Lt. Gen. L. D. Heaton, and to the commander of Brooke Army Medical Center, Maj. Gen. James Snyder, for their foresight, imagination, and hard work.

[From Time magazine, Mar. 5, 1965]

BATTLEFIELD READINESS

The wounds of the battlefield casualty often cry out for the most advanced skills of modern medicine. But the battlefield surgeon has always worked against forbidding odds. Aseptic surgery is practically impossible in a tent operating room of the sort that has gone almost unchanged for 100 years. The canvas is far from airtight, and temperature control is so bad that an infusion bottle might freeze and shatter in mid-operation. The lab work that is essential in today's medicine and surgery is usually out of the question.

Now all such problems can be relegated to the past. Last week at the Army's Camp Bullis, near San Antonio, medics demonstrated a portable, air-conditioned hospital—aseptic operating room and all. Under a miniature mushroom cloud that signified a theoretical A-bomb attack, while scores of "casualties" splashed with blood-red paint waited for treatment, the 20-bed unit was made ready within half an hour.

ZIPPERED JOINTS

The hospital arrived on trucks and trailers—a load of bulky packages, some as big as 7 feet by 8 feet by 12 feet, weighing up to 3 tons. From one, corpsmen took four bundles that looked like oversized parachutes and laid them out neatly, edge to edge, on clear ground, then hooked them to an air-hose. Solemnly, the big bags shook out their wrinkles as they were inflated and rose into the familiar, half-round shape of a quonset hut. The four sections were joined together and the joints zippered airtight. Out of the other packages came 20 beds and all the gear needed for as many patients. Only eight men were needed for the job.

In an equally impressive performance, another crew set up the operating room, which had come in a slightly smaller package. In the center was a versatile operating table adjustable to all nine standard surgical positions. Overhead, from ceiling mounts, hung three groups of lights, of 1,500 foot-candles each, which can be aimed at different parts of the body if a man has scattered wounds and needs surgery on his head, trunk and legs at the same time. The table weighs only 200 pounds as shipped, but need not wobble because there is a base tank that holds 100 pounds of water.

ADDED PRESSURE

The Army calls its new hospital MUST, from medical unit self-contained transportable. Impressed observers could suggest only one potential drawback. What would happen under a strafing attack? Would a few bullet holes cause leaks in the

walls and let the whole pneumatic construction collapse? The Army had not overlooked the obvious: added air pressure can compensate for most holes.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, Feb. 24, 1965]

ARMY TO DEMONSTRATE NEW HOSPITAL IN SOUTH AMERICA

(By John Barbour)

A mushroom cloud erupted over Herr Hill, and the casualty count was devastating. It was only a mock attack, but it set the scene for the U.S. Army's new hospital in a box.

The hospital, flown to San Antonio by helicopter or toled by truck, can be set up and ready for surgery in less than half an hour. In the primitive, hurt world that must follow atomic attack, it is an impressive bit of civilization.

The units would replace the old canvas field tents in which Army doctors say some men died in war because the stresses of cold and heat added to the shock of their wounds.

"In some of those tents, you'd be operating on a man over here, and in the corner plasma bottles would be freezing and cracking open," one doctor remembered.

SOLONS COMING

Today the Army plays host to the House Armed Services Committee and representatives of industry and medicine to show off this new hospital concept that the Army wants for its strike units and thinks is a prime development for civil defense.

"It's the first integrated advance in field hospitals since the Civil War," said Col. John Trenholm, of the Army Surgeon General's Office.

The hospital comes in three boxed units—a gas turbine that supplies heat, air conditioning, electricity, hot and cold water; an inflatable ward that looks like a rubber quonset hut; and a box that unfolds into a fully equipped surgical room.

Any number and any variety of the units can be joined together into a single building with the use of fabric air locks that provide hallways where needed.

VIETNAM TEST

The Army would like to have at least 15 or 20 400-bed hospitals of this type, and probably more. It may test one of the prototypes within the next 6 months in South Vietnam.

The cost, fully equipped with modern medical devices from new operating tables to anesthesia units, might run up to \$2 million for a 400-bed hospital.

Army doctors say the cost, while twice that of current field hospitals, would be worth its weight in human lives.

The inflatable ward—though it seems vulnerable to a pinprick—is sturdy even under fire from an automatic weapons. Army doctors say the structures provide excellent insulation.

The hospital units are manufactured by Garrett Corp. of Los Angeles, a firm which produces gas turbines and pressurized aircraft cabins.

The Army's demonstration takes place on the hills of Camp Bullis outside San Antonio. GI's are made up to demonstrate the wounds that can occur when enemy aircraft deliver a small nuclear device on a target behind the lines.

Representative GONZALEZ Wednesday described the mobile field hospital being demonstrated at Camp Bullis as a "remarkable and magnificent achievement."

The Congressman said the military facility will result in the savings of "untold numbers of lives" if it is ever needed in a combat area.

"I am going to push for this type of hospital," the lawmaker pledged. "I wish to commend the Surgeon General and the staff

of Brooke Army Medical Center for their work and the ingenuity they have shown in the development of it," GONZALEZ continued.

GONZALEZ said the new type transportable hospital is a "major breakthrough" in the field of technology and hospitals.

"I have of course been aware of the great prestige of the installation known as Brooke Army Medical Center and I have seen technicians trained there work throughout the world," he continued.

GONZALEZ was one of a dozen Congressmen who attended the demonstration of the mobile field hospital at Camp Bullis. Included in the congressional delegation were 10 members of the House Armed Services Committee.

There were 600 civilian and military dignitaries in attendance at the demonstration.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express, Feb. 25, 1965]

"MUST" HOSPITAL SHOWN

Ranking Army officers, Congressmen, and other VIP's shrouded in heavy blankets and coats, braved icy weather Wednesday to view the first official demonstration of Operation MUST at Camp Bullis.

The unique concept in field hospitalization has been in development only 19 months and incurred favorable comments from the Army Surgeon General, Lt. Gen. Leonard T. Heaton. "MUST is a high level of hospital care never before attained," General Heaton said.

MUST (for medical unit self-contained transportable) is a three-part field hospital unit, the most revolutionary part being an inflatable patient ward. The 20-patient unit looks like a rubberized quonset hut.

The other two units consist of an expandable operating room made of wood and a power unit to supply air conditioning and air pressure as well as hot and cold water.

General Heaton said it would be 18 months before MUST will be integrated into the Army medical services program if the idea is accepted.

"First we have to sell it to Congress and the Defense Department," the general explained.

The day-long tour of the unit included a simulated nuclear explosion with realistic wounded soldiers adding to the drama.

The demonstration then included treatment in the MUST facility.

Army officials estimated cost of a fully equipped 400-bed MUST hospital unit at \$2 million. Even though twice the cost of present-day tent hospitals, General Heaton justified the added expense.

"Any medium that works better is well worth the millions. The surgery advantages alone are worth the effort and expense," he said. "I can see its use in Vietnam certainly."

The MUST concept can be applied equally as well to civilian disaster relief agencies. The highly mobile unit can be airlifted to the most remote area and be erected, ready for delicate surgery, on a moment's notice.

MUST was developed by the Garrett Corp. of Los Angeles and the American Hospital Supply Co.

General Heaton would not comment on how many MUST units might be ordered for Army use should the facility be approved. An Army spokesman said, however, that normally there are three field hospital units per division and there are now 15 divisions.

"We would hope to supply all of them with the required number of field units first," said Col. John Trenholm of the Army Surgeon General's Office.

Viewing the demonstration Wednesday were nine members of the House Armed Services Committee. They were Representatives FRANK E. EVANS, Democrat, of Tennessee; CHARLES S. GUBSER, Republican, of California; DURWARD G. HALL, Republican, of Missouri;

PORTER HARDY, JR., Democrat, of Virginia; RODNEY M. LOVE, Democrat, of Ohio; LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Democrat, of Michigan; OTIS G. PIKE, Democrat, of New York; WILLIAM RANDALL, Democrat, of Missouri; and ROBERT WILSON, Democrat, of California.

Also on hand were representatives of industry and medicine, San Antonio's U.S. Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, and Mayor W. W. McAllister.

PEACE CORPS DESERVES SUPPORT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, this country has demonstrated for many, many years that it is searching for ways to contribute to mankind, and the means to seek a peaceful relationship with governments on all continents. Under the administration of the beloved John F. Kennedy, the concept of the Peace Corps was born and put into a tangible program which has brought a new light to scores of people in almost 50 countries. The Peace Corps is a living tribute to that great President.

President Lyndon B. Johnson has shown that he plans to expand this worthy program and that he desires to provide through the Peace Corps volunteers the unique technical assistance and the vibrant enthusiasm which can be made available through the Peace Corps. Such actions are deserving of our praise and of our help at this time.

The Peace Corps represents a partial answer to the complex and nagging problems of our time. Problems which will not disappear in this or the next generation. The Peace Corps is a part of the assertion of leadership that America must exercise in a troubled world. It is a demonstration of the worthwhile and single desire we have for an existence with all nations without conflict, for a prosperous world.

A great President has shown us the way; a second one has demonstrated the wisdom to continue the Peace Corps in even larger proportion. Ours is the obligation to follow their lead and give support to this program which is at work for the cause of peace throughout the world.

BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE STUDY OF THE FEASIBILITY OF DEVELOPING A DEICING SYSTEM FOR THE GREAT LAKES AND THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my bill to authorize the study of the feasibility of developing a deicing system for the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway so they will be available for navigation during the entire year.

The possibility of providing ice-free navigation channels through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway 12 months a year instead of only 8 has, I am happy to say, aroused considerable interest. In September 1963, the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee held hearings on this legislation and at that time Mr. Franklin Snyder, Civil Works Division, Office of the Chief of Engineers, testified as to the techniques and methods which have been developed for the practical utilization of such a proposal.

The most common deicing procedure is called air-bubbling in which air tubes in the water are used to raise the warmer water from the bottom to the surface to melt ice. New machinery and equipment has been developed and is in use. There is some work in this area which has been done in the Arctic by the military and at Port Radium in Canada, Northwest Territory on the Great Bear Lake, they keep ice which is normally 5 feet thick there open during the winter months by air-bubbling in order to permit a dredge to operate year around in recovering ore tailings which they are now processing.

While it is true, of course, that most of this work has been done in small areas, narrow channels and short distances, according to the Corps of Engineers there is plenty of warm water at the bottom of the Great Lakes which could provide energy to keep a channel open. I would hope, therefore, that this legislation which only asks \$50,000 for a feasibility study to investigate the possibilities of such a venture would receive prompt and favorable consideration. Considering the vital role which navigation on the Great Lakes plays on the total economy of our Nation, any new information which ultimately leads to a further understanding of the control of our water resources would be of national benefit and the matter should be fully explored because of its economic and national defense aspects.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include a recent newspaper account of the International Association of Great Lakes Ports meeting at which a Canadian port official urged the executives and directors of more than 20 United States and Canadian ports to get behind this proposal and I urge the same of my colleagues:

LAKES PORTS HOPE TO MELT BARRIERS TO LONGER SEASON—METHOD OF CLEARING ICE OUTLINED BY TORONTO ENGINEER AT CHICAGO SESSION

CHICAGO, February 4.—“You have to melt men's minds before you can melt the ice,” the Canadian said.

The ice is the reason why the St. Lawrence Seaway has been closed 4 months a year since the seaway opened in 1959.

The mental barrier reflects the opposition—political and traditional—to finding

ways to open the seaway in the winter, a feat that would greatly increase traffic.

The speaker was a Canadian port official in Chicago for the winter meeting of the International Association of Great Lakes Ports, a group made up of the directors and other executives of more than 20 United States and Canadian ports.

The political opposition stems largely from eastern ports, leading foes of the seaway because they attract tonnage that normally would flow to inland ports. This is especially true of some eastern Canadian ports that do practically all of their business in the winter, he noted.

The port directors have two goals. They want the seaway closing date extended from November 30 to a firm December 15 to coincide with the closing of the Welland Canal that links Lake Ontario and Lake Erie west of the seaway.

They also want, in the long run, to keep the seaway open all year. Not only would this boost tonnage for their ports but it would increase seaway revenues.

The early closing date, even if extended several days when weather allowed in the past, costs seaway ports valuable tonnage. The officials point to the four ships that failed to enter the seaway last December 5, the closing date set by the Canadian authority. The eastbound ships were trapped at Great Lakes ports for the winter, costing the owners an estimated \$1 million or more.

Shippers have flirted with the closing date in the past and, until last year, never got caught; many believe the four ships could have cleared the Canadian stretch of seaway, even if it meant calling in icebreakers.

The effect, it is feared, is that some foreign shipping lines will play it safe and schedule one less sailing at the end of the 1965 season.

A port official taking a positive view is Jack Jones, chief engineer of the port of Toronto, who heads an IAGLP committee studying the problem.

“The season could be extended 2 weeks and possibly longer,” Mr. Jones said, “by using icebreakers and some comparatively inexpensive techniques, such as wire to hold ice back from shipping lanes and bubbling devices to keep ice from forming.”

For bottlenecks, such as the two narrow locks near Montreal, the eastern end of the seaway, Mr. Jones proposes increasing water flow and cutting slots in the dike that protects the shipping lanes from the St. Lawrence River.

RESOLUTION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND TO THE PRESIDENT TO OBTAIN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT LIMITING IMPORTS OF WOOLEN-WORSTEDS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island entitled “Resolution of the general assembly memorializing the President of the United States in view of economic conditions in communities dependent upon the woolen-worsted industry, to obtain at the earliest possible

moment an international agreement limiting imports of woolen-worsted":

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, IN VIEW OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN COMMUNITIES DEPENDENT UPON THE WOOLEN-WORSTED INDUSTRY, TO OBTAIN AT THE EARLIEST POSSIBLE MOMENT AN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT LIMITING IMPORTS OF WOOLEN-WORSTEDS

Whereas the woolen-worsted industry in the city of Woonsocket and the State of Rhode Island has suffered severe losses in woolen-worsted plants and employment due to the large woolen-worsted imports; and

Whereas increasing imports of woolen-worsted produced by low wage foreign nations prohibit a reasonable competition with said imports, resulting in the total liquidation of 24 woolen-worsted or related plants in the Woonsocket area with an aggregate peak employment in excess of 5,000 workers, from 1950 through 1965; and

Whereas the loss of the above woolen-worsted plants has reduced sources of tax revenue to the city of Woonsocket and has prevented the overall community payroll from enjoying a steady growth consistent with the national economy and the rising cost of living; and

Whereas the threat of continuing imports has discouraged existing woolen-worsted plants from further investments in plants and equipment; and

Whereas unemployed woolen-worsted workers find it practically impossible to find other employment; and

Whereas the continuing depletion of small woolen-worsted plants has reduced the overall number of competitors in that industry, permitting a handful of larger plants to grow and thus reduce the intensity of competition so essential to our economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the general assembly hereby memorializes the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States, to consider the above factors for all communities strongly dependent on the woolen-worsted industry, and that he increase his efforts to obtain at the earliest possible time a comprehensive international agreement, limiting the imports of woolen-worsted in order to restore to the domestic woolen-worsted industry an equitable competitive position; and be it further

Resolved, That the general assembly directs the secretary of state to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States, to the Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE and the Honorable CLAYBORNE PELL, Senators from Rhode Island, and to the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY and the Honorable FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Congressmen from Rhode Island.

Attest:

AUGUST V. LAFRANCE,
Secretary of State.

BILL TO ALLEVIATE FINANCIAL HARDSHIP TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WITH THE CLOSING OF VARIOUS FEDERAL BASES AND OTHER INSTALLATIONS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to alleviate the financial hardship which will be experienced by Federal employees and their families with the closing of various Federal bases and other installations.

As a result of the termination of these facilities, the jobs of many of these workers will be abolished. Others will be able to retain positions if they are able to relocate to another area. The bill I offer allows these career civil service employees to retire if they have acquired 20 years of service, without incurring the penalties now in effect.

Under the existing Civil Service Retirement Act workers who lose their jobs not for cause may retire if they have completed 20 years of service and are 50 years of age or if they have civil service credit of 25 years, regardless of age. In each instance, the individual incurs a sharp reduction in the pension which would be available if he retired under the normal conditions—30 years' service at 60 years of age. The annuity is reduced by 1 percent per year if he retires between 59 and 55 years of age. Below age 55 the pension declines an additional 2 percent each year. Thus, an individual separated under these circumstances may receive a pension totally inadequate to supply even the necessities for himself and his family, much less any of the amenities normally available to citizens generally.

The bill I have proposed will remove the 50-year minimum age requirement and will eliminate the reduction in pension now applicable. This does not mean that the employee retiring under the measure will receive the same pension as if he had remained in Federal service for 30 years and until attaining age 60. It will permit computation of his annuity based upon his years of service, without reduction for age.

My colleagues are fully aware of the effects of closing military bases, veterans facilities, public health service hospitals and other Government activities on individuals who have devoted a career to public service. The legislation I suggest would ease the impact of this action on thousands of employees, who will be compelled to either move from long-established homes, accept reduced pay in other jobs or leave the Federal service. Understandably, many employees are reluctant to uproot their families from homes they have purchased in neighborhoods where they have established ties, to move into other localities with no guarantee of a permanent job. Similarly, they do not relish the prospect of accepting positions at greatly reduced pay below their capacities. Faced with the alternative of job loss, the measure I offer would permit them to turn to retirement as an alternative.

Many of the workers affected have reached an age where it will be extremely difficult to secure comparable jobs. They should not be required to lose their Federal positions and a large part of their civil service retirement benefits as well.

The Federal Government as a responsible, humane employer has an obligation to assist employees facing these conditions so that their lives will

not be seriously disrupted or that they will have to rely on completely substandard retirement benefits.

I commend this proposal to the serious consideration of my colleagues.

WORLD DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much for my colleagues to be aware of the fact that Capitol Hill will observe the World Day of Prayer, March 5, with a quiet meditation service in room S-120 in the Capitol from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m.

There will be no organized worship but Members of Congress and Hill staff members are invited to drop by the interdenominational service at any time for a few moments of prayer and meditation.

The service is sponsored by the United Church Women of the Capital area, and Mrs. George R. Davis, chairman of planning for the Hill service, said this will be one of a number of prayer services in the Washington area and around the world.

The chaplains of both the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris and the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, respectively, are cooperating with the UCW on the service.

Mrs. Davis is the wife of the Reverend Dr. George R. Davis, pastor of the National City Christian Church. She is assisted in planning the Hill service by Mrs. William B. Hynds, who worked on the Hill as secretary to Senator Alben Barkley, Democrat, of Kentucky.

The theme of the service observance will be "What Doth the Lord Require of Thee?" and Dr. Harris and Dr. Braskamp will give brief meditations on this at 12:15 and 1:15 p.m., respectively.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. HUOT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The following is the winning speech of Mr. Durwood Littlefield of Manchester, N.H., who will be in Washington the evening of March 9, 1965, at the Veterans of Foreign Wars annual congressional dinner at the Sheraton Park Hotel.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of New Hampshire are justly proud of Mr. Littlefield. His address "The Challenge of Citizenship," exemplifies the patriotic and moral fortitude of the youth of today who are preparing themselves to be leaders of tomorrow.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Durwood Littlefield, Manchester, N.H.)

It seems that in this era we have undertaken a radically new approach to our philosophy of citizenship. The feeling that each individual citizen should assert himself in the affairs of his State and Nation has rapidly declined. Instead, people are assuming a complacent attitude.

What then is the challenge of citizenship in this present day and age? Perhaps the most pressing challenge is the attempt by each citizen to stem the tide of this declination and to stir the people from their state of lethargy. To do so is no mean task. In a society where the word "chauvinism" has become an object of sneers and jests it requires a citizen of strong character indeed to assert openly his beliefs.

The framers of the Constitution desired that each of us take an active interest in all areas of society and government, and that we wholeheartedly strive to preserve the now inherent freedoms that they fought so diligently to obtain. The Founding Fathers believed that only when each citizen assumed his share of the responsibility could the Nation they founded reach the lofty goals which had been set. Therefore, taking an active part in the affairs of the community and Nation is not just a privilege afforded us, but rather a duty, and a moral obligation.

It is apparent that too many of us are satisfied to live within ourselves or within an equally self-centered group of individuals, leaving the rest of mankind to fend for itself. These people merely take for granted the social community of which they are a part, and are content in allowing others to manage their civic affairs, and accept apathetically any legislation imposed upon them. This is done not realizing that they are fulfilling neither their personal requirements nor their capacity for helping others. They continually fail to recognize the tremendous satisfaction that can be obtained by being a true asset to the community. They do so without realizing that such a status is not difficult to attain, but simply requires a determined perseverance, a true understanding of ethical values, and a genuine desire to help mankind. Of course, everyone cannot be a leader in all endeavors, but being a willing worker in the areas with which one is connected, is the essence of a good citizen.

There are no limits to the challenges in the different realms of society of which a true citizen is a part, and each of these regions is vital to the continuance of the ideals of our Nation. Men of integrity, with an appreciation for the feelings and desires of others, accept these challenges by taking an active part in such activities as the Community Chest, Red Cross, and educational organizations. They take part in all forms of government, keeping well informed on both national and local affairs, and never fail to exercise their privilege of voting on all issues.

A citizen must never be afraid to voice his opinion on issues he deems vital to the good of society. Without the voice of approval or discontent from well-informed citizens, the leaders of the community cannot make the

proper decisions which are necessary for its betterment.

Only by the help of the citizen who has accepted his great challenge and has the moral courage to assert his beliefs and voice his opinions, can our Government operate at its greatest capabilities. Those people, having taken up their challenge, daily receive the bountiful rewards from the realization that people have been helped and their community strengthened through their efforts in accepting a challenge put before them.

These are the ingredients needed by a man who desires to accept the challenge of citizenship. Our Constitution is emphatic in the points that we all have the God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Therefore, it follows that we have the right to enjoy the fruits of our labor. No man who has these ingredients could enjoy the fruits of his labor if he did not know within his heart that he had contributed his share of spiritual and material help to his community, his country, and his fellow man.

The challenge is there. One has only to meet it head on and accept its responsibilities and the unbounded rewards of being a true citizen will be bestowed upon him.

FOURTH BIRTHDAY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps which was looked upon by some at the time of its origin as a fragile venture of questionable merit, is now established as one of the greatest humanitarian and effective programs in our history.

No small measure of the success of the Corps is due to the devotion, skill, and management of its Director, R. Sargent Shriver. Although he would never concede, unselfish as he is, that the Peace Corps would not have succeeded without him, let me be one to say that it could never have done as well, since the quality of its program is a direct result of his vision and enterprise.

One of the most valuable dividends from the Peace Corps will be the experience gained by its voluntary workers—experience which they will bring back to the communities of America as part of the two-way interaction of world understanding. I am delighted to know that later this month hundreds of Peace Corps graduates will be coming to Washington to discuss their experiences and lend further support to the future activity and growth of the Corps.

One of the most noteworthy marks of the Corps' effectiveness is that where its success has been greatest it has been the target for the fullness of the diatribe of the enemies of America and the enemies of freedom. On the other hand, among those who need help most in lands where hope for survival was least, among people where hunger and disease were the best prospects, the Peace Corps is truly known and appreciated.

If the children of South and Latin America, the Philippines, and southeast

Asia, the aged and infirm to whom all the world was a dark continent could be brought here on this fourth birthday, they would hardly understand our curious custom of extinguishing candles on the Peace Corps birthday cake. Rather, they would cry out, and hopefully, be heard by us, that we must support the work of the Peace Corps and continue to light candles bringing warmth, illuminating corners of the earth, saving lives and giving new breadth and hope to freedom and justice and love among mankind, so that "Pacem in Terris" will have more meaning for more men.

A TRIBUTE TO THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the others in paying tribute to Mr. Sargent Shriver and the Peace Corps.

Without a doubt, the Peace Corps has proven itself to be the most effective instrument for bringing about understanding between the United States and other nations of the world. It has been the wisest investment in our search for peace. Through its intelligent, dedicated, and hard-working Corpsmen it has helped to create a new image of our country abroad—a change from one of acquisitive, materialistic society of fortune-seeking individualists, to a nation of men of good will seeking to help those in need. This has been the impression expressed to me by countless numbers of Asians I have met, including the Crown Prince of Japan.

Coming as I do from a State which has played a major role in the training of Peace Corpsmen sent to the Asian nations, I take especial pride in saluting the Peace Corps on this anniversary date. The Peace Corps Training Center on the island of Hawaii, under the competent direction of Dr. John Stalker of the University of Hawaii, has won high praises from all who have visited it and inspected its operations. In addition, many of Hawaii have volunteered to join this great service organization and are serving in many sensitive areas around the world. For example, there is Richard Clancy, a physical education instructor in Ecuador; Michael Wilson, a history teacher in Malawi; Clarence Nagao, a communications development worker in Thailand with Timothy Wong, a language teacher, and Joyce Nakahara, an English teacher. Then there are Gerald Taniguchi and Benjamin Chang in Sabah, Malaysia; Erwin and Taeko Wong who served in British Honduras with great distinction; Mataichi D. Osora in Guatemala; Gertrude Okinaga and Albert Peterson in the Philippines; and James Veech in Tanganyika.

Hawaii, of course, can do much more to contribute to the Peace Corps, and

we ask its responsible authorities to use our complex of natural tropical and semitropical settings and multiracial community to full advantage. We believe we can add to the continuing effectiveness of the Peace Corps in its mission of bringing better understanding between the United States and the developing nations of the world.

REPRESENTATIVE MOELLER FIGHTING TO PREVENT CLOSING OF SOME VA HOSPITALS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege. It has just come to my attention that the usually reliable United Press International news service was guilty of a serious error of fact and interpretation in its coverage of consideration of House Joint Resolution 234 by the House of Representatives.

United Press International used the following grossly misleading language in its lead paragraph of that story:

Ohio's delegation Thursday voted 12 to 10 in favor of a Republican motion to trim foreign aid bill by enough to keep all Veterans' Administration hospitals in this country open.

The article went on to report, inaccurately, that I voted against keeping the Veterans' Administration hospitals open.

The fact is, of course, that the motion in question would not have, by any stretch of the imagination, prevented the closure of a single VA hospital or facility. This motion was a hoax; it represented no more and no less than a desperate, frantic attempt to embarrass the President of the United States and tie his hands in the conduct of foreign policy. Fortunately, the true nature of the motion was easily recognized by the majority of the Members of this House. It was defeated and done with.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I and the overwhelming majority of the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives voted on February 10, 1965, for an amendment preventing the closure of any VA installation before May 1, 1965. The amendment was adopted, and the President accepted it. This gave us 75 days to persuade the Administration of the urgent necessity of maintaining the great network of VA hospitals which serve the men and women who defended their country in time of danger and peril.

At this point, I insert that portion of my January 25 news report to the people of the 10th Congressional District of Ohio, which puts me firmly on record as opposing any effort to close any VA hospitals so long as they are required for the treatment and care of our veterans:

VA HOSPITALS SHOULD NOT BE CLOSED

I was shocked by the decision to shut down certain hospitals and other facilities operated

by the Veterans' Administration. Such a step will, in my judgment, create unnecessary hardships and inconveniences for our veterans and their families. The loss of jobs that will result from these proposed closures is also a matter of grave concern to me. While I support reasonable efforts to reduce Federal spending, I think this move comes under the heading of false economy. I am glad to report that Congress appears to be overwhelmingly opposed to the so-called reorganization plan. A congressional investigation already is underway in the U.S. Senate, and the House Committee on Veterans Affairs will open hearings as soon as possible. You may be assured that I am doing everything I can to prevent the abandonment of VA hospitals and facilities.

I am not prepared to play budget roulette with the great and essential network of VA hospitals authorized by Congress for the care and treatment of those Americans who served their country in time of peril. The reorganization order should be canceled without further ado.

Mr. Speaker, in fairness, I hope that United Press International will correct the misleading and inaccurate information it has published about this matter.

ROA MINUTEMAN AWARD—ADDRESS OF HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday night, a most coveted award was conferred by the National Reserve Officers Association on the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. This recognition, the Minuteman Award, has been conferred upon a number of distinguished Americans, none of whom are more deserving of this recognition than the recipient of the award for 1965. Chairman RIVERS, in response to the citation, made an outstanding address on the paramount role of Congress in forming the policies for the defense of America.

This address, in my opinion, is one of the outstanding reports on this subject and on the general relationship of one branch of Government to another which I have ever heard. For those who did not hear the delivery of this speech, I insert the text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE L. MENDEL RIVERS, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL NATIONAL COUNCIL BANQUET, FEBRUARY 26, 1965

Admiral Reeder, distinguished colleagues of the Congress, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am quite aware of the names of those outstanding Americans to whom you have given this, the Minuteman Award; and I am humbled as my name joins this most distinguished group.

No human being, regardless of his assigned station in life, could fail to be deeply moved by such a tribute as this—coming from an organization such as yours.

This is an organization which accurately represents, with distinction, those of your

fellow dedicated Americans who not only helped to win the greatest victory in the life of this Republic, but who also ask for the privilege to serve again, if necessary, and to die if need be.

I consider this award tonight not primarily for me, but to one whom you hope reflects the independence of the Congress—a Congress which will carry out the mandate of the Constitution to provide this Nation with the best security in the world; and a Congress which will assure a contented, motivated, and dedicated military, both Regular and Reserve alike; and also a Congress to whom you can turn for recourse in time of honest disagreement with those representing the executive branch of government.

Knowing so many of those you have chosen before, not the least of whom was my beloved teacher and friend, the immortal Carl Vinson, I accept with deep humility this invitation to join these select few.

Now, you realize, I know, that it would not be appropriate, or proper, for me to discuss here this evening the burning issue that so vitally affects the Reserve Officers Association and so many other veterans.

As you know, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, under the very distinguished chairmanship of the Honorable F. EDWARD HEBERT, will conduct hearings on the proposed merger of the Army Reserve with the National Guard; therefore, it would be improper for me to comment on that proposal tonight.

Many distinguished Members of Congress have raised interesting questions concerning the manner in which the merger proposal will be implemented.

Other Members have expressed their disappointment with respect to the procedures followed in announcing this merger—its timing as well as its genesis.

Some Members have queried me as to how the decision was reached, who recommended it, and whether it is militarily sound.

My reply has been that those answers must await the hearings. And hearings there will be.

You and others will have your day in court.

The imponderables raised by the decision of the Secretary of Defense to change the status of a segment of our Reserves are manifold. We will explore these and the long-range effect on our security.

But questions of this nature impel me to discuss a somewhat delicate subject with you tonight, although I do not mean to imply any correlation between the subject matter of my remarks and the dispute which raised the questions.

It is not my intention, or my desire, to offend any individual who is present here tonight. I strive to make this plain—I neither impugn nor deprecate the intentions of those who have made the decision.

Instead, I would like to ask you to join me as I take a short walk down the path of history.

One hundred and seventy-six years ago, almost to the day, on March 4, 1789, the first Congress of the United States, under the new Constitution, met in Federal Hall in New York City. The new Congress consisted of 20 Senators and 59 Representatives, since not all the States had ratified the Constitution.

The Constitution under which they met vested all legislative powers in the Congress of the United States, executive power in the President, and judicial power in a Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress might establish.

The Constitution was clear with respect to the powers vested in each of the separate branches of Government.

At that time, Members of the Senate were appointed by State legislatures, but Members of the House were elected, every 2 years, by the people.

Thus, every 2 years, the entire membership of the House of Representatives had to stand for reelection.

That has never changed insofar as the House is concerned and, today, of course, Members of the Senate are also elected by the people.

Since that date in history, each branch of the Government has been the subject of criticism by political scientists, cartoonists, editors, sensation seekers, ordinary citizens, Members of Congress, members of the judicial branch, and even Chief Executives. This is as it should be. This is one of the great freedoms we all enjoy.

But one fact of life remains unchanged—the Congress of the United States is elected by the people directly, and the House of Representatives must be reelected every 2 years.

I conclude, therefore, that the House of Representatives more nearly reflects the people's views than the other House or any other branch of Government.

Certainly, the judicial branch of Government, which is appointed for life, not only does not, by design, represent the views of the people, but, in a strict constitutional sense, should not, since its function is to interpret the laws, not make them.

The fact that our Federal judiciary has been making laws with increasing frequency represents one of the most violent assaults your Constitution has sustained since this Republic was born. This Supreme Court is even arrogating unto itself the authority to reorganize State governments and apportion State legislatures.

The Chief Executive of the Nation has become a more vital office with each passing decade.

As the complexities of Government grow, as the population increases, the responsibilities imposed upon the President of the United States grow accordingly.

The Constitution of the United States, perhaps prophetically, recognized that this office would become more important as the years went by and vested in the President rather broad, and in some cases, undefined powers.

One of the undefined powers is that of the President's position as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and, of course, the Air Force, and of the militia of the States when called into the actual service of the Federal Government.

Certainly the President, under our political system, represents the views of the people who have elected him to office. But again, I say, I do not believe that any branch of Government can be closer to the people than the Congress of the United States and, especially, Members of the House.

The three great branches of Government are the hearthstone and the fountainhead of our form of government. If any single branch becomes topheavy through the assumption of powers not granted under the Constitution, then a crack appears in these vital and indispensable foundations of our Government and our freedoms are threatened.

And yet, for the past few years, there has been an increasing tendency on the part of some people to ridicule the Congress of the United States; to describe the Congress as outmoded and inefficient; to look upon it as an organization that is not responsive to the needs of a modern society; and, more important, to deny or disregard the constitutional duties and powers that are imposed upon the Congress.

Those who ridicule the Congress, those who join this iconoclastic throng, are sowing the seeds of destruction of our form of democracy.

The Congress of the United States is an institution. It is part of our way of life. And just as our society has its folkways,

mores, and customs, so does the Congress have its customs and precedents.

Every sound institution grows and changes with its growth. Congress is no exception. Thus, Congress can, and should, be amenable to constructive criticism and acceptable modifications.

But change is one thing—ridicule is something else.

I wonder if it has occurred to those who belittle the Congress for being too cumbersome, too slow, too oldfashioned, that the checks and balances built into our form of government were not the result of accident, but the deliberate intent of our Founding Fathers.

The Congress has proved time and time again that when speed is essential it can act quickly; but the Congress also frequently makes haste slowly, and while this may be irritating to those who seek immediate change, it is a safeguard for the interests of others who may be vitally affected.

We are a nation of many and varied interests. We hear much about minority groups, but sometimes we forget that minorities in this Nation also consist of physicians, farmers, social workers, housewives, railroad employees, lawyers, teachers, bricklayers, soldiers, pilots, and lion tamers. We are a nation of a multitude of minorities—and it is only when a substantial group of minorities share a common interest that they become a majority.

Your great organization, the Reserve Officers Association, for example, is a minority group, because less than half the population of this country are members. But it will have its day in court with respect to the proposed merger of the Army Reserve and the National Guard. This I guarantee.

Those who recommend this change in our reserve structure do not necessarily represent the views or opinions of a majority of the American people. And, certainly, they cannot exercise a power given only to the Congress of the United States.

Who, then, has the right—or even beyond that—the responsibility to question this decision? The answer, obviously, is the people's representatives, the Congress. Without this haven of refuge, those affected, or their organizations, would have no place to go.

How else can the American people make their voices heard if not through the Congress of the United States?

Last month, I stood on the floor of the House while our great and beloved Speaker administered the oath of office. Here is what the Speaker asked each of us:

"Do you solemnly swear that you will support the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God."

With my hand raised, I answered, "I do"—and to myself I said, "Believe me, I do."

And do you know what that oath means to me? It means that I will support that Constitution—that I will bear true faith to it—and that I will discharge the duties of my office. So help me, God.

And one of the provisions of the document I swore I would support says that the Congress has the power to provide for the common defense; that the Congress has the power to raise and support armies; that the Congress has the power to provide and maintain a Navy. And since no other branch of Government has that power, then obviously only the Congress has the responsibility in this area.

And the Congress, in turn, has passed on this responsibility—in the formative stages of the legislative process—to the Committees

on Armed Services, the gavel of which fate has placed in my hands.

This is not a light responsibility. And it is one I can assure you the Committee on Armed Services of the House, as far as I am concerned, will meet in every respect.

For example, there is a group who would like to see our Chiefs of Staff system changed. Having won World War II with a Joint Chiefs of Staff system, there are those who would abolish it and substitute in its place a single Chief of Staff—a system that brought defeat to two major powers who have tried it.

I can assure you—the Congress will be the final arbiter of this question.

There are also those who think that the Congress should merely appropriate funds and let the Executive spend them in accordance with his wishes.

This is not my understanding of my responsibility under the Constitution. Certainly, changes can be made in our legislative process, but back of our whole form of government stands the bulwark of the Congress of the United States, represented as it is by every major religion in this country, by every major nationality, by every major profession, and representing a cross section of the entire gamut of the American people.

This is the strength of our Government. The Congress of the United States is you—the people.

But, today, when a Member of Congress visits a military installation in a foreign land, there are those who refer to such a visit as "a junket." If a civilian Defense Department official visits the same installation, it is a highly important visit to discuss defense matters.

If a Member of Congress, trying to represent his people to the best of his ability, votes against a proposal submitted by the executive branch of Government, he is called an obstructionist. But if he votes for it, he may be called a rubber stamp. A Member of Congress is a bird on whom all seasons are open.

I would suggest to the carping critics of the Congress that they take stock of their own well-being and of the success this Nation has enjoyed in the past, and is now enjoying.

Certainly, some of this success must be attributed to what the Congress has approved or disapproved.

Our way of life, our steadfastness, our well being, our economic progress, and our security may not necessarily be a monument to the Congress, but no one can deny that the Congress has been a living, growing institution while all of this has taken place.

I would be the first to agree that the Congress, as a body, and that Members of Congress, as individuals, have made mistakes. But I suppose that this is inevitable since we share one characteristic in common with all others who are engaged in the activities of government. Be they chief executive, kings, sultans, admirals, generals, filing clerks, or messengers—we are human beings.

And just as there is a variety of personalities in every organization, so is there a variety in the Congress.

But regardless of his capacity or his ability, each Member has been elected by the people of his district or State to serve in the Congress of the United States. The people are the judges of his qualifications. He must account to them.

Notwithstanding the fact that we may have shortcomings and admitting that improvements can be made, not only in the legislative process but also in the executive and judicial fields, our form of government is still acknowledged, in the free world, as the finest that has ever existed in the history of civilization.

Be critical of the Congress if you will, but those who are contemptuous of the Congress and its responsibilities are undermining a way of life that has brought greater

freedom, greater security, and greater economic benefits to a nation of people than has ever been enjoyed by any collective group in the history of the world.

Be assured that there is an ever-increasing number of Congressmen who are aware of their responsibilities—and more important—intent to meet those responsibilities.

National security is a team effort—but all members of the team have to know the signals.

As far as I am concerned—the Armed Services Committee of the House will know the signals, and on occasions, may even call the plays. We demand at least an occasional opportunity to carry the ball. It's just possible that our team has some stars of its own. How can we ever find out if our team never carries the ball?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 10 minutes, on Tuesday, March 2; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, March 3; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FUQUA (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 60 minutes, on Monday, March 8; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. STANTON.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. CRAMER to insert tables in remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today in a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN].

The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCLORY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YOUNGER.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. MAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. STAGGERS.

Mr. WHITENER.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 21. An act to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 2, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

651. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary dollar grants to a foreign country under the foreign assistance program, Agency for International Development, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

652. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes" (H. Doc. No. 96); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

653. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the ninth annual report on the financial condition and results of the operations of the highway trust fund for fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 209 (e) (1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (H. Doc. No. 97); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

654. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, establishing the minimum price support level for peanuts"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

655. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes for the quarter ended December 31, 1964, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

656. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

657. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a semiannual report on military construction contracts for period July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, pursuant to sec-

tion 605, Public Law 88-390; to the Committee on Armed Services.

658. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report relative to the proposal to transfer *Massachusetts* (BB 59), now condemned as not suitable for naval use, to the U.S.S. Massachusetts Memorial Committee, Inc., Boston, Mass., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

659. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the continuing review of voluntary agreements and programs, pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

660. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

661. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the unused mail-flo system equipment at the Chicago post office, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

662. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the deficiencies in contract administration resulting in additional costs for exterior concrete construction at the Brecksville, Ohio, hospital, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

663. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate administration of centralized payroll activities, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

664. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequacies in procedures and practices relating to selection of and review of performance of recipients of social security payments on behalf of minor and incompetent adult beneficiaries; Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

665. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs to the Government by leasing rather than purchasing electric power facilities; Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

666. A letter from the Governor, Panama Canal Zone, and President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report of disposal of foreign excess property by the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for year ended December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 404(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 398); to the Committee on Government Operations.

667. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend title 28 United States Code section 2241 with respect to the jurisdiction and venue of applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody under judgments and sentences of State courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

668. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a report of a study of selected programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, pursuant to Public Law 85-315, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

669. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report indicating proposed actions by the Administration to conduct certain research and development programs at levels in excess of those authorized by the NASA Authorization Act for fiscal

year 1965, pursuant to section 4 of 78 Stat. 310, 312; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4185. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 4152. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5075. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act; with amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 5555. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 5556. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to include the variety known as "Compana" as a malting barley eligible for increased acreage under the 1965 feed grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5557. A bill to make permanent the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954 and to increase the amount of payments available under such act to an amount equal to the gross receipts from duties; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 5558. A bill to provide support for public elementary and secondary education in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5559. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5560. A bill to provide research, technical, and financial assistance with respect to the disposal of solid wastes to the several States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 5561. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase widow's benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5562. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act with respect to the U.S. Botanic Garden, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5563. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921, in order to provide that the foreign market value of imported firearms and ammunition which have been disposed of as surplus by a foreign government shall, for the purposes of such act, be not less than the constructed value of the merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5564. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize retirement without reduction in annuity of employees with 20 years of service involuntarily separated from the service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5565. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5566. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to provide that the authority to enter into trade agreements under such act will expire at the close of 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5567. A bill to provide for the transfer of income taxes to the States for use for educational and other purposes without Federal direction, control, or interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5568. A bill to provide research, technical, and financial assistance with respect to the disposal of solid wastes to the several States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FALLON (by request):

H.R. 5569. A bill amending section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948, relating to the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5570. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt State-conducted lotteries from the taxes on wagering; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 5571. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5572. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 5573. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 5574. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5575. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to establish the number of hospital beds and domiciliary beds to be

operated in facilities of the Veterans' Administration, and limiting the authority of the Veterans' Administration with respect to closing of facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 5576. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to proceedings against certain witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 5577. A bill to provide that certain corporations shall continue to be treated as corporations for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 5578. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a crime to steal certain trade secrets or to transport stolen trade secrets in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 5579. A bill to further economic development by rehabilitating areas presently damaged by deleterious mining practices; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 5580. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay certain expenses of moving property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 5581. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 5582. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 5583. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 5584. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 5585. A bill to permit any wage earner to defer payment of a portion of the difference between the income tax imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1964 and the amount deducted and withheld upon his wages during 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 5586. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5587. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 5588. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Pima and Maricopa Counties, Ariz., and to the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., of certain lands for recreational purposes under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5589. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that certain veterans who were prisoners of war shall be deemed to have a service-connected disability of 50 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5590. A bill to prescribe the size of flags furnished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to drape the caskets of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 5591. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 5592. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs and counterfeit drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 5593. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 5594. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5595. A bill designating the fourth Friday in September of each year as National Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5596. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5597. A bill to relieve physicians of liability for negligent medical treatment at the scene of an accident in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 5598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5599. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY (by request):

H.R. 5600. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe in North Dakota and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5601. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5602. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 5603. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 5604. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 5605. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5606. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education, and training, and loan guarantee benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after January 1, 1962, in combat zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5607. A bill to provide Federal cooperation in a program to preserve certain historic properties in the city of Boston, Mass., and vicinity, associated with the colonial and Revolutionary periods of American history; to authorize the establishment of the Boston National Historic Sites; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 5608. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for charitable contribution will not be allowable with respect to contributions to certain charitable organizations which fail to make full disclosure to the public; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 5609. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5610. A bill to prohibit disturbances in the Chambers of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 353. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.J. Res. 354. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 355. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution authorizing the publication as a House document of the Department of State white paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State Publication 7839); to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Res. 250. Resolution to prohibit the Civil Aeronautics Board from discontinuing service by local service airlines until after a thorough review by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H. Res. 251. Resolution to express the sense of the House against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

60. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, petitioning that the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States be urged to restore the payment for the production of castor beans on diverted land to 50 percent of the basic payment for diversion; to the Committee on Agriculture.

61. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of legislation increasing the basic sugarbeet quota to a minimum of the 1965 restricted acreage production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

62. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to bring the question of the liberation of the Baltic States before the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

63. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning apportionment of one house of State legislatures on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

64. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting all Federal and other non-California agencies which were damaged by recent storms to utilize to the fullest extent personnel and equipment available in the vicinity of the damage for the repair or reconstruction of damaged facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

65. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the House of Representatives to permit the continued activity of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

66. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the reversal of the Veterans' Administration decision to close the Cheyenne, Wyo., offices of the Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 5611. A bill for the relief of Satoshi Nakayama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 5612. A bill for the relief of Andrea Castellano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5613. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 5614. A bill for the relief of Miss Mamako Yoneyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 5615. A bill for the relief of J. L. Bryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 5616. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Mario Mure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 5617. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gigante, his wife Marietta Gigante, and their minor children Mario Giuseppe Gioacchino Gigante, Valentino Gigante, Graziella Gigante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5618. A bill for the relief of Gioacchino Parete and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5619. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosalia Elvira Sparacino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5620. A bill for the relief of Christos Tassigiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 5621. A bill for the relief of Chun Yin So; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 5622. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5623. A bill for the relief of Barney E. McElyea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 5624. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of Mrs. Hazel M. LaFrance against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5625. A bill for the relief of Milena Fedel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5626. A bill for the relief of Hadbo Nahas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 5627. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Mariano B. Pimentel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 5628. A bill for the relief of Mario Cianciulli and his wife Candida Cianciulli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5629. A bill for the relief of Trenton Mack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5630. A bill for the relief of George Demetrious Maniatis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 5631. A bill for the relief of Phebe Viola Bravo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5632. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sang Kyung Lee (nee Chol); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5633. A bill for the relief of B. Matu-sow & Son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 5634. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Pruett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5635. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (by request):

H.R. 5636. A bill for the relief of Saadet Eroglac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5637. A bill for the relief of Oliva Furlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

114. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city clerk, Millbrae, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the need for a constitutional amendment on reapportionment, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Gold Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the administration's attitude toward our gold reserve is confusing to the nth degree. First, we have a bill presented by the administration and passed by the House increasing the capital of the Inter-American Development Bank by \$750 million which is to be loaned to Central and South American countries. While the House was passing this bill, the President was addressing 370 business executives called to the White House, admonishing them to cut their expenditures to the bone where they involved sending our dollars abroad.

Then I read in the Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., issue of February 23 a statement that our colleague HALE Boggs, of the Ways and Means Committee, is expected to offer an administration-backed bill providing for generous tax credits for private U.S. investments in underdeveloped countries and they refer to the President's mention of such plans in his foreign aid message. The tax credits would be applicable to insured investments—against expropriation, nationalization, discriminatory tax treatment, and so forth. On February 23 the Secretary of Commerce issued a news release of his talk before the Travel Advisory Council asking them to stimulate the travel of foreigners into this country but to curtail the travel of our people into foreign countries.

Because of the heavy drain on our gold reserve, it would seem that the time is right for the administration and the various departments of the administration to get together and at least play the same tune even though they might be using different instruments. It is appar-

ent that dollars sent abroad, regardless of how they are sent, may return in the form of a demand for gold.

The Death of Justice Felix Frankfurter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States have been saddened by the passing of Mr. Felix Frankfurter, retired Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and a man who has left an eternal mark on the legal and judicial history of this Nation.

Mr. Frankfurter enjoyed a career of nearly 20 years on the Supreme Court bench, beginning with his appointment in 1939 by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He brought to the Court his experience as a Harvard University law professor for 25 years, as well as a background as an attorney, scholar, presidential adviser, and Government administrator.

He has been recognized as one of the greatest scholars and teachers of law in Harvard University's long and distinguished history. Numbered among his former students are judges, former Cabinet members, and assistant prosecuting attorneys.

Mr. Frankfurter, as a friend and adviser to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was considered one of the architects of the New Deal, which helped steer the United States out of the disastrous depression of the early 1930's.

As a Supreme Court Justice, Mr. Frankfurter embodied a philosophy which has become known as judicial restraint. He firmly believed that a judge should look only at the validity of a law, and not its merits. He urged extreme

caution in making decisions on the actions of the legislative and executive branches of the Government. He felt that the courts should move exceedingly slowly and deliberately in overturning actions of men and bodies elected by the people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. Frankfurter will stand in history as one of the truly great Justices of our Federal Supreme Court, ranking with such giants as John Marshall and Oliver Wendell Holmes. Let me close by citing the tribute paid him by his fellow Justices upon his retirement in 1963: "He has already made a contribution to our jurisprudence rarely equaled in the life of our Court."

Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

In the proposed Peace Corps legislation that this body has received from our President, there is the opportunity for us to continue a part of our foreign relations program which has shown great return on the dollars we have authorized for it. The significance of this legislation is that it will authorize funds which represent only a small fraction of our overall budget for the next fiscal year, and only a small part of our total overseas programs.

The dollars spent in the Peace Corps program have gone a long way to prove to nations around the world that we seek to help others better themselves, and that we are a country seeking peace. Peace Corps volunteers, now numbering almost 10,000, have shown and are continuing to